

THE
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.
New Series.

Vol. II.]

MARCH, 1828.

[No. III.]

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

THAT TIMOTHY WAS AN EVANGELIST.

THE facts in the history of the church, which might aid us in deciding upon the nature of the offices mentioned in the New Testament, having been investigated; we are prepared to inquire into the written word, on the matters of church government. Although the particular form is but a mean to an end, and of no vital importance; yet it is expedient to defend the cause which God honors, against those exclusive pretensions which have been founded in usurpation.

Two things having been established; that episcopacy, whether parochial or diocesan, was not in existence at the commencement of the age which next followed the days of the apostles, but arose afterwards step by step; and that lay presbyters were never heard of till necessity drove Calvin to the expedient; they ought to have no place in the interpretation of the New Testament.

But it so happens, that the conformity in duties between the diocesan bishop and the apostle and primitive evangelist; and the contrast of the oversight of an individual church by its presbyters, with an episcopate in after ages; are now adopted as arguments to prove, contrary to the verity of facts, that diocesan bishops are actually the successors in office of the apostles

and evangelists, and not of the presbyters in the churches. Thus Timothy and Titus are exhibited as scriptural examples of bishops, though never once designated by that name in the sacred records. Titus is described by Paul as his "*partner*" and "*fellow-laborer*." (a) Of Timothy he also speaks, as his "*fellow-laborer*," and an "*evangelist*." (b) Their work appears to have been to ordain bishops, in the sense of presbyters. Timothy was invested with the gift, "*by prophecy with the imposition of the hands of the presbytery*." (c) And in another epistle, Paul speaks of the "*gift of God, which was in him by the imposition of his hands*." (d) These texts, we have seen, were differently understood in successive ages, according to the progressive advances of episcopacy. (e)

This commission was given him before Paul had visited Ephesus, and without relation to the people of one place more than another. It was in its nature universal, extending alike to the whole church,

(a) κοινωνος εμους και εις υμας συνεργος. 2 Cor. viii. 23.

(b) εργον ποιησον ευαγγελιστου. 2 Tim. iv. 5.

(c) δια προφητειας μελα επιθεσεως των χειρων πρεσβυτεριου. 1 Tim. iv. 14.

(d) χαρισμα του θεου, ο εστιν εν σοι δια της επιθεσεως των χειρων μου. 2 Tim. i. 6.

(e) Christ. Spec. Oct. 1827. p. 507.

and conferring every power necessary to planting, watering, and governing the churches, wherever he should come, if not superseded by the presence of an apostle.

The office was like those of apostle and prophet, extraordinary and unconnected with any particular charge. Ephes. iv. 11. But in whatsoever church he preached, he could as evangelist ordain pastors, or bishops, or there was no propriety in the caution, "lay hands suddenly on no man." This office was superior to that of "pastors *even* teachers."(f)

Evangelists were not personally instructed and commissioned by Christ; nor had they the extraordinary gifts in equal extent, nor the unerring assistance, or inspiration of the apostles, for the writings of of Mark and Luke were received upon the authority of Peter and Paul.

That Paul and Timothy were together at Ephesus, and that Paul left him there when he went on some occasion into Macedonia, may be plainly inferred from 1 Tim. i. 3. "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia." The time to which there is here an allusion is the more easily ascertained, because the apostle is recorded to have been twice only at Ephesus; on the first occasion, he merely called on his voyage from Corinth and Jerusalem; on the second, he went from Ephesus into Macedonia, according to the words of the epistle.

That Timothy was left at Ephesus, when Paul, expelled by the riot, went into Macedonia, obtains satisfactory proofs. Before he wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians, Paul sent Timothy and Erastus into Macedonia, but he himself remained in Asia for some time. Acts xix. 22. 1 Cor. iv. 17. xvi.

(f) Τὸς ποιμένες καὶ διδασκάλους, denote the same officers.

10. In the first letter to the Corinthians, which he wrote at Ephesus, and sent by Titus to Corinth, he mentioned his purpose of coming to them, but not immediately; of which Luke also informs us, Acts xix. 21, and desired them, if Timothy came to them, 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11, to conduct him forth in peace, that he might come to Paul, then at Ephesus, for he looked for him, with the brethren. When he closed that letter, he was expecting Timothy's return, which that letter might also have hastened. Paul remained at Ephesus, on this visit, the space of three years. Acts xx. 31. There is therefore no reason to suppose, that he was disappointed in his expectation of the arrival of Timothy from Corinth at Ephesus, before he went into Macedonia; and if so, he might have left him there, as he at some period certainly did. 1 Tim. i. 3. He had intended to go by Corinth into Macedonia, 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, but changed his mind and went by Troas thither. 1 Cor. xvi. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13. Whilst in Macedonia, he wrote his first letter to Timothy, for he proposed to him to remain at Ephesus until he should call there on his way to Jerusalem. 1 Tim. i. 3; iii. 14, 15. The words imply, that Paul might tarry some time; and that he did so before he went into Greece, is fairly implied in the expression, "And when he had gone over those parts, and given them much exhortation, he came into Greece." Acts xx. 2. Timothy was advised, solicited, or besought (παρεκαλῆσα) to abide still at Ephesus, which gave him liberty to exercise his discretion, but several motives must have influenced him to go to the apostle. The enemies at Ephesus were numerous and violent; Timothy was young; his affection for Paul ardent; the request of Paul that he should abide at Ephesus was not peremptory; and Paul told him he expected to

tarry a long time. Also Timothy had been, from their commencement, familiarly acquainted with the churches in Macedonia and Greece. Accordingly we find Timothy in Macedonia when Paul wrote his second epistle to the Corinthians. 1 Cor. i. 1. The apostle went from Macedonia into Greece, Acts xx. 2, as he had promised in that letter, chap. xiii. 1, and abode there three months. Acts xx. 3. Timothy was with him at Corinth, for he sends his salutations to the Romans, Rom. xvi. 21, in that famous epistle written from thence. (g)

That there was sufficient time for Paul to have written from Macedonia to Timothy at Ephesus, and for Timothy to have spent some months at Ephesus, before he came to Paul in Macedonia, appears from the time he waited for Titus at Troas, 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13, his determination not to go to Corinth till he could do it without heaviness, 2 Cor. ii. 1, his distress in Macedonia before Titus arrived, 2 Cor. vii. 5, and his success in raising charities for the saints in Judea, 2 Cor. viii. 2, 3; ix. 4. He had intended to tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, but went sooner, Acts xx. 1. He passed on to Jerusalem at another Pentecost, Acts xx. 16; all which time he was in Macedonia, except three months. Acts xx. 3.

That Paul expected to spend so much time in Macedonia and Greece, may be collected from his intimation, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, that he might spend the winter with the Corinthian church. The apostle's purpose of sailing from Corinth was disappointed by the insidiousness of his own countrymen; he therefore went up into Macedonia again, that he might pass over to Troas with his companions. Timothy was among those who crossed first. Acts xx. 3, 5. Paul's disappoint-

ment in sailing from Corinth, and his wish to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost, prevented the call he intended at Ephesus, 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15, but he landed at Miletus, and sent for the elders of the church at Ephesus.

The directions of the apostle in the third chapter of the first epistle to Timothy, fairly imply that he had left the church at Ephesus, according to his usual practice, without officers; for he gives this evangelist, not a new commission, he already had power to ordain, but instructions as to the choice of bishops, that is presbyters, and deacons. These had been complied with before he landed at Miletus. Acts xx. 17. This record of the existence of elders at Ephesus, compared with the directions given to Timothy, not only renders it probable that Timothy had ordained them, but fortifies the presumption that the first epistle to Timothy was written in Macedonia, before this visit to Jerusalem, and consequently before his imprisonment.

The language "I going (*πορευόμενος*) into Macedonia, besought thee to abide still at Ephesus," did not form a permanent connexion between Timothy and Ephesus. At the very greatest extent, the instructions given in this letter were of a continuance only till Paul should come to him (*εως ἔρχομαι*) 1 Tim. iv. 13; iii. 14. But it is certain, that Timothy did not remain at Ephesus, till Paul passed on his way to Jerusalem.

The second epistle of Timothy will prove itself written by Paul when a prisoner at Rome; and at least establishes the absence of the evangelist from his spiritual father, at the time it was written. But he was at Rome in the time of the first imprisonment, as has been proved by his having been joined with Paul in the letters to the Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. Demas and Mark were also there in the

(g) Compare Acts xviii. 2, with Rom. xvi. 3. Vide Acts xviii. 19, 26. 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

first imprisonment, Col. iv. 10. 4, but absent at the writing of the second to Timothy. 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11.

It is therefore an error to suppose it to have been written before the epistle to the Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, during the first imprisonment. Also in 2 Tim. iv. 20, Paul tells him, Erastus abode at Corinth; but this needed not to have been told to Timothy, if Paul meant that Erastus abode at Corinth, when he went to Jerusalem, and so to Rome, for Timothy was then with him, and must have known the circumstance, had it been so. In like manner he says, *ibid.* "Trophimus have I left at Miletum, sick." But Trophimus was not left at any place on the voyage to Jerusalem, for he was there and the occasion of the jealousies of the Jews. Acts xxi. 29.

These two facts, compared with this, which appears in the epistle, that it was written by Paul a prisoner at Rome, afford sufficient certainty, that there was a second imprisonment when this letter was written.

But it by no means follows, that Timothy was at Ephesus when the second epistle was written. This ought not to be assumed, but shown. If Timothy was then at Ephesus, why should he have been told, "I have sent Tychicus to Ephesus?" 2 Tim. iv. 12. He must have arrived at that place before the letter, and the fact could have been then known. Also Tychicus needed no introduction to Timothy. Had Timothy been at Ephesus, Paul would not have sent him to Troas, for articles he had left there. It appears more probable, that Timothy was, at the time the epistle was sent to him, at Troas, or in the neighborhood of that place. The salutations will not establish the destination of the epistle. Onesiphorus resided in Asia, but the particular place of his abode

is not known. He helped Paul both at Ephesus, and Rome. Also Aquila, who had resided at Rome, at Corinth, at Ephesus, and again at Rome, was a native of Pontus, on the margin of the Euxine. Trophimus, whom Paul had left at Miletum, was an Ephesian. Acts xxi. 29. Miletus was near Ephesus, and Timothy would have known the facts, unless Miletum in Crete was the place.

If Timothy was not at Ephesus when the second letter was written to him, there is no evidence of his being in that city, after Paul's first imprisonment. But if he had been at Ephesus, he must have then left it, the letter calling him to Rome, and the sacred records speak not of his return to that city. The second epistle assigns to Timothy no other duties than those proper to his general office of Evangelist; and bears no relation to a particular oversight of any church or churches.

Some writers suppose that Paul, when he landed at Miletus on a subsequent voyage to Jerusalem, left Timothy with the elders of the church at Ephesus, "to govern them in his absence." But nothing of the kind was spoken on the occasion; and instead of a temporary absence, Paul assured the elders they should "see his face no more." In 1 Tim. i. 3, it is not said, "when I went to Jerusalem," but expressly, "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, *when I went into Macedonia.*" Also it has been asserted, that the apostle, having placed Timothy at Ephesus prior to his first imprisonment, "wrote both his epistles to Timothy while a prisoner at Rome." But Timothy was with Paul at Rome during a part of the first imprisonment, for he is joined in the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. Salutations also might have been expected in the first epistle to Timothy, had it been written from

Rome, as in those to the Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and the Hebrews. He was indeed absent from Rome during a part of the time of the first imprisonment, but Paul expected his return, Heb. xiii. 23, and so far was he from hoping to come unto Timothy shortly, as expressed in 1 Tim. iii. 14, he promises, if Timothy come shortly to Rome, with him to visit the Hebrews. Also it seems strange, if Timothy had been at Ephesus when the epistle to the Ephesians was sent by Tychicus, Ephes. vi. 21, that no notice whatever should have been taken of the beloved youth.

Another hypothesis is, that Paul, when the Jews deterred him from sailing from Corinth, and he determined to go through Macedonia to Jerusalem, besought Timothy to abide still at Ephesus; to which, when Timothy agreed, he went forward to Troas, with Aristarchus and the rest; and whilst waiting there for Paul, Timothy received the first epistle from the apostle, written in Macedonia. But this is a departure from the correct meaning of the passage, which is that Paul besought Timothy *προσμεῖναι*, to continue or remain at the place where Timothy was at the time he was thus entreated. Those who went before with Timothy to Troas are represented to have accompanied Paul into Asia. Acts xx. 4, 5. This circumstance renders it an improbable supposition, that Paul should write so long and important a letter to his fellow traveller, whom he must overtake in a few days; and wholly unaccountable, that he should say in the letter, 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15, "these things write I unto you, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long," &c. That Paul should have thus purposed to come to Timothy unto Ephesus, but really at Troas; and in a few weeks afterwards, without any apparent cause for a change of

views, should have said at Miletus to the elders of the church of Ephesus, "I know that ye all shall see my face no more," Acts xx. 25, exhibits a fluctuation approximating versatility. If Timothy was on this occasion left with the officers of the church at Ephesus, and especially, if he was to be thenceforth their diocesan bishop, it is strange that not a word of either of those circumstances should have been mentioned to those elders. But so far was the apostle from mentioning their subordination unto, or support of the authority of young Timothy, that he enjoins them; "take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost *hath made you ἐπισκοπους bishops, to feed the church of God,*" &c. But as not a word is said of leaving Timothy at Miletus, so it is improbable that he should have parted from Paul there, because he appears to have been of the company of the apostle, when he arrived at Rome, where he is joined with him in the letters which have been mentioned.

Others allege, that Paul visited Ephesus after his first imprisonment, left Timothy there, went into Macedonia, and from thence wrote to him his first letter. They build upon the circumstances, that whilst at Rome, he had written to Philemon to prepare him lodgings at Colosse; and that he had told the Philippians, by letter, he trusted he should shortly come to them.

This opinion is much more respectable than either of the former; and although several of the fathers have positively asserted, what is incompatible with it, that Paul went into Spain, after his first imprisonment, according to his purpose expressed Rom. xv. 28, yet, however credible these holy men were, their conjectures deserve often but little regard. That Paul was at Philippi after his imprisonment is probable, because he left Erastus at Corinth. 2 Tim. iv. 20. Also he may have

been at Colosse, if he left Trophimus at Miletus; but the place was Miletum. *ibid.* He entertained a purpose subsequent to those, of visiting Judea with Timothy. Heb. xiii. 23. This may have been first accomplished, and Timothy left in the neighborhood of Troas, where he remained till the second epistle was sent to him. But if these purposes were effectuated, which is matter of uncertainty, there is not a word to prove even an intention to visit Ephesus. The letter to the Ephesians neither mentions Timothy, nor any coming of Paul. But Tychicus, a faithful minister of the Lord, and companion of the apostle, was named as sent to them. Ephes. vi. 21. To the Ephesians Paul had said, that he knew they should "see his face no more," Acts xx. 25; and it is no where shown that he did. The supposition that nevertheless Paul afterwards went to Ephesus with Timothy, left him there, with the request to tarry till he should return to him, and then went into Macedonia, and wrote his first epistle to Timothy, is entirely gratuitous and without the least reason appearing in any exigencies of the Ephesian church; which had had three years of Paul's labors, and had been afterwards long blessed with the regular administration of the ordinances by pastors of their own, besides help from Tychicus, and perhaps others.

If Paul constituted Timothy bishop of Ephesus, it is an affirmative, and ought to be proved. But Paul tells the presbyters of Ephesus at Miletus that the Holy Ghost had made them *bishops* (*ἐπισκοπους*) of that church. Those elders had previously received the powers which were necessary to ordaining others; on Timothy a similar presbytery laid their hands at his ordination. If this circumstance will not show that a presbytery could have ordain-

ed an evangelist, an apostle not being present, because evangelists were extraordinary officers of a higher grade; yet it must prove that a presbytery have some power to ordain. They were the highest fixed officers in a church, and the power of ordination was necessary to their succession. They could not have been appointed coadjutors to Timothy, in the ordination of themselves. And it does not appear they were ordained before the riot, when he was left at Ephesus. If thus there were no officers in that church when Paul left it, the direction to Timothy, who was an evangelist, to ordain bishops, that is, elders, in Ephesus, was to do no more than his duty; which, when accomplished in any church, gave such bishops, or elders, power to continue the succession. If the presbyters of particular churches had not the power of ordination, there has been no succession in the church of Christ since the deaths of the apostles and evangelists; for their offices expired with them, and there were no officers of a higher order. The office of Timothy was given to him prior to his visiting Ephesus. The duty assigned him was afterwards declared to be the work of an *evangelist*. 2 Tim. iv. 5. His appointment to Ephesus was temporary, being limited, at the farthest, to the time when Paul should come to him; but an earlier period of its termination was evidently left to his discretion, which he exercised by coming to Paul into Macedonia. Thus there was a disruption of the connexion, if any had been fixed; but none such was intended; the epistle was neither a commission, nor an ordination, but a *mere letter of instruction*, directing him in the discharge of his high and important office of evangelist.

If Timothy returned to Ephesus from Rome, which is not recorded in the Scriptures, and died there, it

will not establish that he ever exercised, or had any other office, than that of an evangelist.

J. P. W.

DEATH SUCH A SCENE AS THE SINNER EXPECTS NOT.

So saith he that hath the keys of death and of hell, "In *such* an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." It may be *such as to the period of its arrival*. It may come suddenly when you do not expect it. And this is probably the fact with most men. Even those who die of lingering infirmity are often surprised at an hour when they are not aware of it. When you are crying, "peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon you, and ye shall not escape." How often do we have occasion for the remark, while bending over the bier of one whose death has long been expected, that, "after all, he died very *suddenly*!" "No one was expecting it *then*." And what multitudes are cut down by untimely death, without any warning at all! One is on his journey, and by a trivial circumstance is dashed in pieces. Another is on a voyage, suspecting nothing, till he is instantly overwhelmed with the scalding element, or sinks in the mighty deep. One at his labor, and another at his amusements, falls by the stroke of unsuspected disaster. One is suddenly smitten with delirious disease; another by the shaft of death while wholly at ease amid his family; and another is found dead in his bed, with no signs of struggle or of warning. How unsafe to leave one's home, without a preparation for a home in heaven! How unsafe to close one's eyes in sleep, without a preparation to awake in eternity!

Death will also be *such a scene as you think not in regard to its circumstances*. The dread messen-

ger will come in a shape which you do not expect. Whatever calculations you make as to the manner and circumstances of your death, I may safely warn you, that you will find it "*such* an hour as you think not."

One imagines he shall die of consumption. Not being prepared to meet the "Son of man," and not wishing to make his preparation till "the eleventh hour," he may flatter himself that it will be his lot to be taken out of the world by this gradual disease; and that he shall have timely warning to make himself ready. He may cherish this expectation because consumption is an hereditary disease in his family; or because his slender frame exhibits a predisposition to the disease; or satan may induce the presumption without any reason. And with this presumption, he suffers sabbaths and the most solemn warnings to pass unheeded or unimproved;—and with the same presumption, he says to the good Spirit of God, when beginning to impress his heart, "Go thy way for *this time*; when my convenient season of lingering disease shall come, I will call for thee." While others in the sanctuary about him are smitten with conviction under the powerful exhibition of God's holy law, or sweetly melted to submission by the dissolving accents of his lovely gospel, he remains unsubdued and unaffected. Why? because he hears not? or because he deems the gospel a trifle? Perhaps neither;—but because he is hearing for future and not for present application. He is engrossed in treasuring in his *memory* what others are receiving directly to their *hearts*. He is busy in imagining and resolving how he will improve these warnings and instructions at a *future time* on his languishing bed. This may be the reason why he is not under conviction now—why he is not converted now—like others

enjoying the same means of grace. Thus, sabbath after sabbath, and one "season of refreshing from the presence of the Lord" after another, pass away, and leave him an impenitent sinner. But what is the end of this sinner? Does his "convenient season" at last come, in which he improves all he has diligently treasured against that day? No. But in an unexpected moment, while he is relying on this long cherished calculation, death meets him in some fierce array, and hurries him before the judgment-seat. Away he is hastened by surprise when he has scarce time to think that the hand of death is gripping him in his grasp. In expiring agony he exclaims—this is such an hour as I thought not. Though often warned, I could not be made aware of it. Again he cries out—all is lost; and dies in horror.

Another of the same general description, passing through the like scenes, and resisting the calls of the gospel in the same way, is finally called to end his probation by the very disease he had expected. It is indeed the consumption, and in manner and form just as he has seen others linger and die of it. Still, in the actual experience of the disorder, he finds the circumstances of decay, as it respects a preparation to meet his Judge, as effectually different from what he had imagined as if he had been arrested by a delirious fever, or smitten senseless by the palsy. Instead of finding that timely and effectual warning of approaching dissolution which he had expected, the common fact is verified, and he does not believe the disease fatally seated upon him, until it has nearly consumed his vitals, and exhausted the energies of life. All that long season of gradual decay which he had so fondly calculated upon as the period in which to prepare for death is *gone* before he is convinced that he is drawing near the verge of the

eternal world. He might sometimes have the suspicion that this was the messenger he had been expecting; but he harbored no such serious apprehension as to rouse him to the work he had assigned to this period. When the disorder attacked him, it was at an earlier season in life than he had expected. At first, it was only a cold, which he hoped to throw off in a few days. Though attended with some unusual symptoms, he trusted they would shortly subside. And when he continues weak, and his symptoms become more aggravated, he imputes it to the addition of a little more cold, or the unfavorable operation of some particular medicine. He believes a few weeks will restore him. The weeks come; but he is not restored. Still it is not the consumption, in his view, that keeps him low. He changes his diet—and changes his medicines—and has great hopes from the change. But not recovering, he complies with the advice of friends to journey for his health. A change of air and scenery revives him, and he feels strongly encouraged. But, on his return, some slight disaster soon brings him lower than ever. He may then be a little alarmed; but shortly his fears are mitigated by the thought that his relapse is to be attributed to the want of skill in his physician. He applies to another. And when he does not cure him, he applies to a third. In the mean time, his friends speak encouragingly to him; and to keep up his spirits, induce him to frequent diverting scenes and lively company. They studiously avoid any allusion to death, lest it should make him melancholy; and when they speak of religion at all in his presence, it is only in a very general manner—not in such a way as to intimate their apprehension that he may soon need its consolations. Even the heart-broken mother who weeps in secret, does not venture

into his presence till her tears are dried and her countenance cheerful. He is informed of one remedy after another which has proved efficacious in just such cases as his; and feeling confident that *something* may cure him, he tries the prescriptions, and occasionally fancies himself better. In this way he goes on till very near his end. And then his friends are compelled to tell him, what they dared not before lest it should alarm him and prevent his recovery, that they fear his disease is incurable. When he comes to hear of the progress his disease has already made, and how near it may be to its termination, he is utterly surprised. Perhaps he believes it, and is thrown into despair of making his peace with God in this short remnant of days, and in the debilitated state to which he is sunk. And perhaps, on the contrary, the scene is so different from what he had imagined, that he cannot believe death to be nigh; and he may still flatter himself with hopes of recovery quite on to the very day of his death. And perhaps there may be at once combined such a despair of repenting in his present state and such a presumption of recovery as utterly to indispose his mind for any serious thought on the subject.

Thus he finds after all, that it is such an hour as he thought not. This kind of sickness and death, though bearing the same name, presents a very different scene from what he had imagined—*totally* and *fatally* different, as to its being a favorable time to prepare to meet his Judge.

The consumption is called “a flattering disease.” It is true—yes, *doubly* true. It flatters us, in distant prospect, with the promise of certain repentance. And when it comes, it flatters us into the belief that its withering hand is not upon us till we are perishing in its grasp—the fatal work done—and the

fancied favorable hour gone utterly by beyond recall! Alas, how very few have ever repented while declining of this disease. And where was the individual ever found who could pronounce it in his own case a “convenient season!”*

* The writer of this article is deeply and gratefully sensible of the benefit accruing; (at least to himself,) from the views above expressed of the insidious nature of this disease. He has long had these views; and they have served both as his guide and his stimulus to the timely discharge of his parochial duty to the sick in a number of instances. For the encouragement of others, he hopes it will not be deemed improper to state two cases which occurred during the past summer.

Two young men in different parts of my parish began to languish nearly at the same time. Consumption was feared, though not very strongly suspected at first. I thought it my duty to converse with them at an early day. And deeming it important to have not only the consent but also the uniform co-operation of their friends, I informed them of the frank disclosure of our fears which I wished to make, and of the advice I should give, and desired them to aid the impressions by their prayers and counsel from time to time according to their best wisdom. They readily assented, and I believe were faithful. The way thus prepared, the substance of my communications to these sick persons, though made at different times and with as much delicacy as faithful explicitness would admit, was briefly as follows.

“I am come to visit you, not only as your friend, but your minister, and desirous to benefit as well as to gratify you. Perhaps you would like to know what your friends think of your case?” “Yes.” I will then tell you frankly and fully. We have much hope—yet serious fears lest your disease should terminate in consumption and prove fatal.—A very treacherous disease.—What do you think of yourself? “Perhaps my friends are right.” Are you prepared for death? “No.” Now then is your time. Should you recover, you will not regret this improvement. But if you are soon to die, now is probably your only time. You yet have strength, clearness of mind, power of discrimination, and power of feeling; and you will have some little time to evince and test your hope. I make this frank disclosure thus early that I may give you timely warning; and it

Now, if experience shows that Christ's declaration is strikingly true in that case on which above all others men fondly dote, what can be expected when death comes in some more violent and sudden manner. Would you correctly estimate the opportunity then afforded, let this estimate be founded on facts and not vain imagination. Go and stand over the sick bed of a fellow mortal who has deferred repentance to that hour. See him in every stage of disease. Mark him while tortured with those fierce pains which violent disease inflicts in its first assault. With what lion strength it grapples on its victim. And his strong nature, while yet unsubdued, struggling and buffetting amid the billows of disease. In the anguish of the first onset, he has no moment and no thought to bestow on a preparation for death. Visit him again at a subsequent period, when his malady begins to gain the mastery of his constitution, and he has no longer the strength to sustain nor the sensibility to feel such tossing, racking agonies. You see him more still and silent. What is now the spectacle? Is this comparative calm which has succeeded, the convenient season you are promising yourself? Leisurely seated by his bedside, you may there watch what is going forward, and then judge. Mark how

is with the hope that you will regard it. But should I find you at a future period crippled with disease, I shall have little courage then to hope for your repentance.—You have no time to lose—no time to work out self-righteousness, if that were possible. Christ must be your whole Saviour—he offers himself as such—does not require impossibilities—does not require of you the external duties of the healthy.—Will you try to follow these simple directions *immediately*? “Yes.” I desire to bless God for the hope that he granted unto each of them repentance unto life. One of them rapidly yet joyfully sunk to the grave. The other recovered and has since made a profession of his faith.

the destroyer who has now gained the mastery, is more gradually bringing on the catastrophe. Gaze on the wan countenance of the victim as he lies exhausted and languishing. The bloom and freshness of health, are exchanged for the livid image of death. See the now imploring, now despairing eye he turns on his physician. And now be silent, while you hear the faint and hollow groans forced by those un pitying pains which ever and anon are returning to finish their work upon him. And now, again, as they subside for a little space, see him feebly wave his emaciated hand and with exhausted strength just moving to and fro his restless head. And now he reclines in quiet for a momentary respite. Nature is left to breathe and gather a little strength to bear up through another struggle. During this little season of stillness, approach; and in a soft and sympathizing tone, ask the poor soul the question if he is enjoying that convenient, that happy season to make his peace with God, which he used to promise himself on the dying bed. Ask him if this is such an hour as he had thought of in which to meet the Son of man. Oh! the iron heart cannot be found in the bosom of man, to put such a question at such a time! You know the answer he would give. And you know the agony of horror with which such a question must overwhelm his sinking spirit. If not utterly stupid, the very thought of that delusion which made him presume on a death-bed repentance, strikes as a dagger to his heart, more envenomed than the shaft of death! Visit such a scene as this, and it will repeat in your ears, with more than an earthly emphasis, that kind but rejected premonition of our Savior—“in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh. Such, O precious but deluded fellow mortal.

will you soon find it, if while in health, you continue to postpone your preparation to meet him. When flesh and heart shall fail you, then will you mourn at the last and say; how have I hated instruction and mine heart despised reproof.

V.

REMARKS ON 1 COR. XV. 22—26.

THE resurrection and its attendant circumstances constitute the principal subject of this chapter. Yet, as is well known, the portion of it now before us is often used to prove the final salvation of the whole human family: a tenet, subversive of good order, and destructive to the soul. But the twenty-second verse speaks solely of the resurrection: in proof of this, examine the preceding and subsequent verses. Supposing that verse 22, speaks of universal salvation, what can be the meaning of verse 23 and 24? "But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming: then cometh the end," &c. What would be the meaning of these verses? Doubtless, the resurrection is the subject of the 22d verse: give it any other sense, and the whole passage is involved in dark obscurity.

Verse 24 brings into view a transaction which succeeds the resurrection and the general judgment. Then cometh the end; that is, the end of Christ's work in the office of Mediator. His work is then done: his redeemed are rescued from the dominion of death; and introduced, bodily, to eternal glory. His enemies too are then judged, and sentenced to interminable wretchedness. He reigns, till he has put all his enemies under his feet. Then terminates his work in the capacity of Mediator. It was no part of his mission to mediate between God and fallen an-

gels; nor between God and sinners in hell. Only in behalf of the race of Adam, while resident in this world, did he interpose. Consequently, when the resurrection is past, and the world burnt up, and Adam's posterity all removed to eternity; then the Mediator's work of intercession will be completed, and his mediatorial kingdom will, of course, cease. He must reign till all his enemies are subdued. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.

Death destroyed! What does this mean; Is death an enemy? Certainly. Death is an enemy to our peace and comfort in this world. He bears us away from all the good and all the enjoyments of this life. It would be more delightful for us to pass unto glory without dying, as Enoch and Elijah did. But we must die; and death is generally a source of terror—he is an *enemy*.

But death is to be destroyed. Death in this passage (verse 26) is evidently personified: it is mentioned as if it were a real person, who has power to take away our lives: in the same manner do we speak of death. We say, death is the king of terrors: and in the Revelation death is described as king of the armies of the dead. And yet these descriptions are only figurative. Death is not a real being—a king clothed with power. When we say, death is the king of terrors, we mean simply, that death is most terrible. And when it is said, death shall be destroyed, the meaning is, that *we shall die no more*. After the resurrection, when soul and body shall have been reunited, we shall die no more: consequently, death, whose work it was to separate soul and body, will have no more employment; and therefore will be destroyed: the destruction of death will take place at the moment when the arch angel's trump shall sound, to call the dead and the living to the tribunal

of Jesus: consequently, death is the "last enemy" that meets with destruction from the hand of the Mediator.

There is a passage of similar import in Rev. xx. 14. "Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire." Death is figuratively called the king of the world of spirits; and hell in this place means simply the world which the dead inhabit, after they leave the body, until the resurrection. This word *hell* is expressed in the original language of the New-Testament, by two words, *Hades* ᾅδης and *Gehenna* γέεννα. The latter is used to point out the place of torment; the former means what we express, by the phrase, *the world of spirits*; and does not decide whether those who are in that world, are happy or miserable. The texts where *gehenna* is used are these—Mat. v. 22, 29, 30: also x. 28:—xviii. 9:—xxix. 15, 33:—Mark ix. 43, 45, 47:—Luke xii. 5:—and James iii. 6. The word *hades*, translated hell, is used in Mat. x. 28:—xvi. 18:—Luke x. 15:—xvi. 23:—Acts ii. 31:—Rev. i. 18:—vi. 8:—xx. 13, 14. In 2 Pet. ii. 4, it is the word hell translated from *Tartarus*.

Gehenna is the place of everlasting punishment. *Hades* does not usually or necessarily signify the place of torment. The rich man was in *hades*; and so were Abraham and Lazarus: but the rich man was tormented, and Lazarus was comforted. They were all in *hades*; in the world of spirits; in a state of separation from the body; and this is what is usually meant by the word *hell* when translated from *hades*. It does not decide whether the persons in that world are happy or miserable: that is to be learned by other expressions. Jesus was in *hades* after he died; (see Acts ii. 31.) but he was not in torment: To-day, said he, shalt thou be *with me in Paradise*.

Rev. vi. 8. And I looked and

behold a pale horse; and his name that sat on him was Death; and hell (*Hades*) followed him. Death is here depicted as the king of the dead; and the inhabitants of *hades*, or departed spirits, are his subjects. *Hades* is the place or the realm where Death, this ruler of departed spirits, puts his captives, or keeps his subjects. Wherefore, it is said, that in the resurrection, (Rev. xx. 13,) Death and hell (*hades*) will deliver up the dead that are in them: that is, in plain language divested of metaphor, soul and body which have been separated, will be united again, to be parted no more: and if parted no more, then Death, this king, will have no more work to do; and *hades*, the world where he puts his subjects, will have no more souls to receive; and therefore death and hell (*hades*) will be destroyed; burnt up; cast into the lake of fire. The import of this verse, then, "Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire," is, that we, after the resurrection shall die no more; nor will our souls be a second time in a state of separation from the body. Its meaning is similar to that in 1 Cor. xv. 26, "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

In the remarks which I have made respecting the word *hell*, I trust that no one will imagine that I have weakened the force of the word, or given an occasion to the sinner to say there is no hell, no place of torment. There can be no mistake on this point; the language of Scripture, the words of the Lord Jesus, are explicit. See Mark vii. 43—48; and Mat. xxv. 41, 46.

The subject contained in the verses at the head of this essay, is—That as we are brought, by our connexion with Adam, into subjection to death; so in consequence of the mediation of Christ shall we all be brought to life again. Had not a Mediator interposed, each one

would have been cast soul and body into hell ; and not have died at all ; just as the wicked will be cast into hell after the day of judgment. Each one will rise in his own order ; Christ the first-fruits. (Christ was the first that rose with an *immortal body*.) Then, all the redeemed will rise when he comes to judge the universe. Paul has not here said any thing respecting the resurrection of the *wicked* ; (for he was writing for the consolation and instruction of Corinthian *Christians*.) But Christ himself has given us specific information of the resurrection of both good and bad ; see John v. 29.

“Then cometh the end” of his mediatorial kingdom. For he must be a king till he hath put down all his enemies :—and “death himself shall die.” At that period, after the resurrection, the whole race of Adam will enter upon a deathless existence. The ransomed of the Lord will then come to the heavenly Zion with songs and everlasting joy : and the impenitent will descend into hell, “where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Interesting indeed will be the transactions of that day when the affairs of this world shall be closed ; when each of the numerous host of Adam’s descendants shall pass in solemn review, before the Almighty Judge.

Another thought presents itself : the Mediator is a King ; and who are his subjects ? Are *you* subject to him ? Then, I ask, what are you doing for the honor and glory of your king ? Does his law live in your soul ? or have you grasped this world and drawn its poison into your heart ? Are you *not* a Christian ? Then know that before he resigns his mediatorial kingdom, he will put all his enemies under his feet. Act now, as the transactions of that coming day will make you wish you had acted. Estimate this world now, as you *will estimate* it

in that day. Do as much for Christ now, as you will wish you had done for him then.

D. K.

THE RISE OF LOLLARDISM; AND THE
MARTYRDOM OF SIR JOHN OLDCASTLE.

THE number of those sincerely devoted to the service and worship of Jehovah, has in all ages been comparatively small. But aside from this general fact, there have occasionally been periods, when true religion seemed almost to have left the world, and the last vestiges of it just on the point of being blotted out forever. In such seasons, Jehovah has appeared by his providence, to restore the captives, and to build up Zion.

Such was remarkably the case just before the dawn of the Reformation. When nearly all Christendom was overrun with popish superstition, and the grave absurdities consequent on a false philosophy, men were raised up who had sagacity to discover the errors of the times, and firmness to withstand them. Of this character were the Lollards, a class of Christians that began to flourish in the north of Italy about the commencement of the fourteenth century, and derived their name from the founder of their sect.

Rejecting the rites and observances of the Romish doctors, who, like the ancient pharisees, had substituted their own traditions in place of the divine commands ; the Lollards, for the sure foundation of their faith and hope, looked to the “law and to the testimony.” They were opposed and denounced as heretics by all the leading men of the popish religion ; but resistance and opposition failed of accomplishing their purpose. The truth became an object of inquiry, and men were urged on, or excited to the

belief and embrace of it, by the very stimulus of the prohibition. Thus was the reformed religion diffused with wonderful rapidity, so that before the death of Lollard himself, who subsequently died by martyrdom, more than eighty thousand had embraced his sentiments. They were scattered over Austria, Bohemia, and the neighboring countries, and fifty years afterwards made their way into England. The celebrated Wickliffe became a convert to their doctrines, and by his labors in preaching against the absurd notions and exposing the vicious practices of the Romish clergy; and by his writings, especially by his translation of the Scriptures into his native language, did more, perhaps, than any other individual towards bringing forward the Reformation.

Though hated and persecuted by the enemies of truth, he acquired great popularity among the common people, and some even among the nobility were found ready to follow his instructions. Of this number was Sir John Oldcastle, better known by the name of lord Cobham.

Like the pious St. Augustin, he had been devoted to pleasure in his youth, and was encouraged in his dissipation by the very ministers of religion to whom he looked for instruction and example. But meeting with the learned and pious Wickliffe, he was led to reform his life, and to become a firm and zealous assertor of the cause of true religion. This he was enabled to do the more successfully, on account of his elevated rank, which gave vast influence to his religious opinions, and also by his exertions to transcribe and circulate the writings of Wickliffe, and maintaining at his own expense a great number of itinerant preachers. It is not to be supposed that such conduct, even in the king's prime minister, was looked upon, by the Romish clergy,

with indifference. Accusation was laid against him, as being a pernicious heretic, and his enemies entreated of the king, as they said, "with all humility and charity, that his majesty would suffer them for Christ's sake to put him to death." Being a brave soldier, as well as a man of talents and learning, he was a great favorite with his king, who was therefore by no means disposed to encourage his prosecution. He promised however to the bloody emissary of the Pope, Arundel, Archbishop of York, that he would himself converse with lord Cobham, and endeavor to persuade him to renounce his errors. But the king, as might have been expected, showed by his conduct in this interview, that he was much better qualified to command the services, than to control the consciences of his subjects. Vexed at his ill success in his endeavors to accomplish what he had so confidently undertaken, he then resigned his former favorite to the malice of his enemies.

The worthy nobleman, after making several ineffectual efforts to avoid a trial in which he knew the judges to have already determined his condemnation, at length submitted to the mandate of the king, and was arraigned for his life before an ecclesiastical tribunal. Perceiving that the storm of persecution raised against him could no longer be delayed, he prepared with manly intrepidity to breast its shock. Unlike the irresolute Cranmer, his principles he never deserted. He loved the truth of his Divine Master, and the hour of trial failed not to prove that his sincerity was genuine. Indeed, so dignified, and so full of truth, were his answers to the malicious and false accusations of his enemies, that they were confounded, and like Felix, when Paul answered for himself, they trembled. But impudence and wickedness soon recover themselves from

the severity of rebuke. As among the poet's angels in the battle, blows may be dealt out heavy and fast, but they fall on souls unsusceptible of feeling.

Long and vexatious was the trial of the noble peer, yet through the whole course of it he manifested the meekness of a saint, combined with the dignified firmness of a veteran Christian soldier. It was a sight for angels, to behold this man of God, "faithful among the faithless, faithful only he among innumerable false, unmoved, unshaken, unseduced, unterrified."

When reproached for scrupulously adhering to the doctrines of Wickliffe, he replied:—"Before God and man, I here solemnly profess, that before I learned the doctrines of that virtuous man, whom you so much despise, I never abstained from sin. So much grace could I never find in all your pompous instructions. My purpose is fixed; do with me as you please: I yield this worthless body to your injustice and cruelty, well assured that ye can do no injury to my soul. With regard to the articles of my faith, founded as I trust they are on the Holy Scriptures; by the grace of the eternal God, I will stand firm to them till death."

But such conduct on his part, excited nothing but malignity in the breasts of his judges, and he was sentenced to the flames. Then in the presence of the court, like Stephen at his martyrdom, he prayed aloud for his murderers.

On the day appointed, he was taken from his dungeon, and triumphantly conducted by his enemies to the place of execution.

I fancy that I behold the gallows-tree, on which this venerable martyr was suspended. The faggots are collected that are to reduce his body to ashes. The torch is applied, and the Genius of persecution exults in her power thus to inflict

on her victim the pains of a double death.

But, is it the proof, and the punishment of guilt and infamy, presented by this appalling sight, a spectacle to surrounding thousands? No! it is the throne of martyrdom; raised, indeed, by the malice of the wicked; but a king in his *triumph* sits upon it. The flames that surround him, though kindled from the pit, are converted into a blaze of glory, which shines but to illuminate to admiring angels, the sublimity and grandeur of the scene. Nay more; they are the chariot and the horses of Israel, which bear him, like the Prophet, to Paradise.

A. H. H.

Andover, Sept. 19, 1827.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

Should you deem these thoughts worth preserving, perhaps you will not reject them for their want of poetic merit, since I believe I have exhibited them as concisely as I could have done in a costume less obnoxious to criticism.

V.

THE MEEK BELIEVER TO HIS GUARDIAN
ANGEL.

SPIRIT of seraph might,
And glorious power above;
Thy home, the world of living light.
Thy bliss, the throne of love;

Canst thou have left that home
To minister to me?
To serve, on swiftest pinions come.
A worm of yesterday?

A sinful, worthless thing,
Who no pure thought can raise;
Rebel too vile against thy King
To dare to lisp his praise!

Then, like the lightning, fly;
Nor stay to linger here,
Fixing that beaming, seraph eye
On guiltiness and fear.

Yes, 'tis to thee I've flown,
All worthless as thou art.
That deep contrition's plaintive groan,
(Breathed from a prostrate heart,

Commencing this thy prayer,)
 Swifter than angel's flight
 Through the vast realms of boundless air,
 Or than the sun-beam's light,

Was in His presence known.
 Instant, "the word came forth:"
 And joyfully I left His throne
 To visit thee on earth.

Surprised?—Thou know'st me not!
 Yet I have well known thee;
 And often, in thy humble cot,
 I've been invisibly.

I've watched thy slumbering bed,
 And bid the Foe depart;
 I've gently swathed thy aching head,
 And soothed thy anguished heart.

In busy scenes by day;
 Or in the guardless hour;
 Or mid the scoffing or the gay,
 When faith most needs such power,

I've quenched temptation's fire;
 I've been 'the voice to say'
 Within thy sin-beguiled ear,
 "This is the only way."

Frail child "of yesterday,"
 How little canst thou know
 Why lofty angels should obey
 Commissions here below.

Raise thy just-opening eye
 To Him who rules the whole;

To Him who left the heavens to die
 To save a sinful soul!

For joy before him set,
 The cruel cross he bore;
 The shame, the agony he met,
 That you might wail no more!

'Tis, then, *our bliss* to come,
 Obedient to his will,
 And aid his ransomed captives home,
 His glory to fulfill.

In peril's darkest hour,
 Raise but your humble cry
 To that omniscient, gracious Power,
 And quick my aid is nigh.

Since hapless Adam fell,
 I have a guardian been;
 And many from the verge of hell
 I've safe to glory seen.

Soon, you will soar above
 To join my growing band;
 With anthems of redeeming love,
 Before his throne to stand.

Another, then, I seek,
 And yet another still,
 Of heart subdued, and spirit meek,
 Who loves to do his will.

This is my blest employ;
 I daily love it more;
 Ye'll swell my never-ending joy
 When time's brief scene is o'er.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES.

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY was called by a joint authority of the two houses of Parliament, during the public commotions in the last year of the reign of Charles I.

This body of learned men may be considered the Parliament's grand council in matters of religion. It was not an English convocation assembled according to the Diocesan way of government; nor was it a national council or Synod called in the Presbyterian or Congregational manner, representing the whole body of the clergy; "but the Par-

liament, we are told, chose all the members themselves, merely to have their opinion and advice for settling the government, liturgy, and doctrines of the church of England; and they were confined in their debates to such things as the Parliament proposed.* The assembly was composed of one hundred and twenty-one divines, and thirty lay assessors, ten of whom were lords, and twenty commoners.

Notwithstanding the king's veto, sixty-nine of the number assembled according to summons in king Hen-

* Palmer quoted by Neal, vol. iii. ch. 11. p. 74.

ry VIIIth's Chapel, the first day appearing there not in their canonical habits, but chiefly in black coats and bands, in imitation of the foreign protestants. The assembly was opened on Saturday, July 1st, 1643, with a sermon by Dr. Twiss, the Prolocutor, both houses of Parliament being present. They adjourned to Monday, when certain rules and regulations were drawn up and agreed on. The assembly being now ready for business, the Parliament sent them an order to review the thirty-nine Articles of the Church. More than two months were spent in debating upon the first fifteen articles, and the result only two slight changes in the ninth and eleventh. Immediately after this the Parliament found their interest so much reduced, that they were under the necessity of calling in the assistance of the Scots, who would afford them aid only on condition of a uniformity of religion and church government between the two nations.

The Scots' commissioners were introduced into the Assembly Sept. 15, and urged the abjuration of Episcopacy as simply unlawful; but the English divines were generally against it. After much debate, the solemn league and covenant, which had been drawn up in Scotland, passed the Assembly with some slight amendments, was ratified by both houses of Parliament, and by an order dated Sept. 21st was printed and published. It was the object of this solemn compact to extirpate Episcopacy, and to unite the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland in defence of civil liberty and the maintenance of the reformed religion, taking the Kirk of Scotland as a model of the greatest purity in doctrine, discipline, and worship.

We may here glance at the different parties which composed the Assembly. A great proportion were advocates for Presbyterian-

ism. A number of the most learned Episcopalians were invited, among whom was Archbishop Usher and Bishop Prideaux; but only a few attended, the king having declared against the convocation: and the Episcopal clergy had entirely deserted the Assembly before the covenant was brought in, so that the Establishment was left without a single advocate. A part of the Assembly were Evastrians, so called from Evastus, a German divine of the sixteenth century. They denied the jurisdiction and coercive power of all spiritual councils, and considered the government of the church as a creature of the state. The Independents or Congregational brethren constituted a fourth party, and made a bold stand against the proceedings of the high Presbyterians. Their number was small at first, but increased much during the session of the Assembly. Whoever will examine the records of this venerable body, will find enrolled names which are an ornament to any country or age. Here was the celebrated Dr. Lightfoot, one of the greatest oriental scholars of the age; and the learned Selden, a lay member, who by his vast skill in oriental learning and Jewish antiquities, frequently silenced the most able divines. The names of Gataker, Greenhill, Arrowsmith, Twisse, and Bishops Reynolds and Wilkins, will ever be conspicuous among those who were most influential in the affairs of this venerable and respectable body. "Lord Clarendon reproaches these pious and learned divines by saying, that some were infamous in their lives and conversation, and most of them of very mean parts, if not of scandalous ignorance, and of no other reputation than of malice to the Church." Mr. Baxter, who knew most of them, says, "they were men of eminent learning, godliness, ministerial abilities, and fidelity; and being not worthy to be one of

them myself, (says he,) I may more fully speak the truth which I know, even in the face of malice and envy, that as far as I am able to judge by the information of history, and by any other evidence, the Christian world, since the days of the apostles, had never a Synod of more excellent divines than this Synod, and the Synod of Dort.* Great abuse however has been heaped upon this venerable body, but it has come chiefly from such as were warm friends to the hierarchy, and opposed to any innovation, civil or religious. We are to look at this Assembly as called to act amid the elements of civil and religious commotion, and whoever will examine the history of the times may see its true character, and learn its merits and its influence. Then the passions of men were blown into a flame, different parties were contending for their separate rights and privileges with enthusiastic ardor; and something was necessary to allay this excitement, to bring public opinion as it were to a focal point, and Parliament sought for this remedy in the Westminster Assembly. That its character and acts should be viewed in a different light by the different parties affected by its measures, can excite no surprise. It would be interesting to enter more particularly into the details of this learned body, but the present occasion forbids it.† Some of the most important transactions, however, must not be passed over in silence. About the middle of July, 1646, when the discipline of the church had been established upon a Presbyterian basis, it was moved to finish their confession of faith. The English divines would have been content with revising and explaining the doctrinal part of the thirty-nine articles of the Church

of England, but the Scots insisting on framing an entirely new system, the Assembly drew up the Westminster Confession, and the Parliament, after a thorough examination of the several articles, agreed to its doctrinal part, and ordered it to be published, June 20, 1648, for the satisfaction of the foreign churches. Some propositions which related to ecclesiastical censures, the power of the keys, and the calling of Synods and Councils, were never ratified by the English Parliament.

While the Confession of Faith was under discussion in the Assembly, committees were appointed to reduce it into the form of Catechisms, one larger, for the service of a public expositor in the pulpit, the other smaller, for the instruction of children; in both of which the articles relating to church discipline were entirely omitted. The shorter catechism was presented to the House of Commons on the 5th of November; but the larger, by reason of marginal references to Scripture, which the House desired might be inserted, was not ready till the 17th of April, 1648, when the House ordered six hundred copies to be printed for the service of the members, and having examined and approved it, they allowed it to be printed by authority, for public use, Sept. 15th, 1648. The chief business committed to the Assembly now being finished, the Scots commissioners took their leave; and if the Parliament, says an historian, had dissolved the Assembly at this time, as they ought to have done, they had broke up with honor and reputation; for after this they did little more than examine candidates for the ministry, and contend among themselves about the *jus divinum* of presbytery. It was not, however, till the 22d of February, 1649, about three weeks after the king's death, that the Assembly, now greatly reduced in number, when it had existed more

* Palmer's Nonconformist, Vol. I.

† The article was written for the anniversary of the Theological Seminary at Andover.

than five years and an half, and held eleven hundred and sixty-three sessions, was changed into a mere committee for examining and ordaining ministers; in which capacity it continued about three years longer, till the long Parliament was turned out of the house by Oliver Cromwell, when they broke up of course without a formal dissolution.

The works of the Assembly were, 1. Their humble advice to the Parliament for the ordination of ministers and settling a Presbyterian form of church government. 2. A directory for public worship. 3. A Confession of Faith. 4. A larger and shorter Catechism. 5. A review of some of the thirty-nine articles. The annotations of the Bible which go under their name is not a work of theirs, but of certain divines appointed by a committee of Parliament.

The influence of this Assembly on the cause of religion in Britain and America continues to the present day, and has we believe been great and salutary, and especially since there was fully unfurled the banner of the Presbyterian Church, which has long waved triumphantly amid faithful soldiers of the cross, and will doubtless guide their march for ages yet to come. There too the clergy of our own country, as well as the great body of English dissenters, beheld the doctrines of the Bible moulded into systematic shape and form, and giving a new impulse to the cause of truth. Here the minister at the altar still finds the original platform of his faith, and here he is taught how to instruct the aged and the young in the pure doctrines of the Reformation. The Westminster Assembly will ever be considered as a landmark of the Church, as a period when the cause of Christianity received a new *impetus*, and the doctrines of the Bible came home with

additional power to the conscience and the heart.

D. A.

Theological Seminary, }
Andover, September, 1827. }

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

If I could know how many respondents I am likely to have to my communication of November, 1827, I should be disposed to wait, till the last had spoken. And if they should all deliver themselves with such an approvable spirit, and in such a truly edifying manner, as A——h——t and Alumnus, I should not think of rejoining even to a score of such generous opponents to myself, and evident well-wishers to the cause I have undertaken to advocate. But since the communication of Evangelist has provoked me to a notice of what I conceive to be his unfair constructions of my object, as well as of the general bearing of his remarks, I shall take the liberty of correcting an unjustifiable inference, common to himself and Alumnus. It is *this*: that I would desire excellence in piety to be rewarded with academical honors.

For the general spirit of the strictures of Alumnus, so truly commendable, I could easily forgive, I had forgiven this piece of severity; especially under the strong temptation which existed, for what I was disposed to regard as a scintillation of pleasantry. But since Evangelist has made the matter so grand an argument, and so serious, I seem imperiously to be called upon for a defence. And what defence shall I set up, unless it be that very justification, which Evangelist after all has awarded me: "So obvious are the folly and extravagance of such a plan, that I cannot attribute it to Antipas."—I doubt not, that this most reasonable conclusion was the impression of his mind

from the beginning; and nothing but a sort of wickedness could have tempted him to such an insinuation. I had surely made no proposal of such an alternative, as a substitution of academical honors for excellence in religious virtue, and what right had he to *infer* it? Such an attempt to divert the mind from an argument too powerful to be met *openly*, is surely beneath the dignity and sobriety of Christian disputants. And yet *one third*, at least, of the communication of Evangelist, is of this description. And what is the character of the other parts?—I will show.

Evangelist says; "A college is, or should be, a world in miniature." And he bases a grand argument upon the assumption, that such is indeed the *fact*. And that nothing is farther from the truth, every one acquainted with college life very well knows. Evangelist himself admits, "there is already too much an artificial state of things there, a state of things not fitted to prepare youth for the business of actual life. Hence," says Evangelist, "a man has generally to *educate himself* for business after he has left college." And this is well and truly said. And how, in perfect inconsistency with these admissions, Evangelist could assert the expediency of a college course, that a youth might be accustomed to the world, because a college is "a world in miniature," I know not. The exact truth is, that a college is a world *sui generis*, and "a man has generally to *educate himself* for business after he has left college." And to be immersed in a college life, if it is not an immersion "in a convent," is at least being buried from the world as it *is*. I would not be understood as asserting this fact against the expediency of a collegiate course, but *merely* to show the inconsistency of Evangelist's reasoning. My own argu-

ment is, that such a course, in its common forms, as a fitting for this world, is too apt to be "a total failure." And my desire is, not for the *abolition*, but for the *reform* of academical education. At present it is indeed too much "like a hot-bed, forcing the principles of our nature to an artificial maturity," and producing a temperament "ill prepared for the tempest or the frost" of life.

Evangelist appeals triumphantly to such products of Christian character as are found in Mills, and Newell, and Fisk, and Parsons, as having grown up in colleges. And why did he not appeal to *Brainard*? *There* he would have found, that such an apostle of God and of the Holy Ghost had grown up in *spite* of a college;—yea, that it was the *opposition* of a college, which made him what he was. It is true, indeed, that many such noble characters, as those named by Evangelist, have formed themselves, under God, notwithstanding all the disadvantages of the common forms of academical education. It is too much of an assumption to aver, that colleges have produced such men. The very question at issue, is, whether, instead of producing them in a *few* instances, they have not prevented their production in a *thousand* instances.

In reply to what I have said of the importance of "keeping alive, cherishing, and nurturing first-love to Christ; of reducing it to order, directing its energies, and rendering its aims infallibly certain of accomplishing its objects;" and of the consequences depending on such culture, Evangelist says; "In all this he entirely overstrains the matter. Experience is decidedly against him. The word of God is against him."

That I have *overstrained* the matter, I have no doubt, is the opinion of Evangelist. That *experience* and the *word of God* are

against me are things to be *proved*. And might he not as well have said, that *Christ* "overstrained the matter," when he said to one of the seven churches of Asia, "I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy *first-love*. Repent, therefore, and do thy first works." I might well be willing, that the *Bible*, said to be against me, should decide this question. And so far as *experience* goes, are we to consult such character, as was found in the Apostles and primitive Christians, or such as has been found in the lapsed conditions and ages of the Church. If Evangelist means the experience of the present age, I admit it is against me.

Besides, that Evangelist refuses to consider the chastened character of that enthusiasm which I advocate, and which I have guarded with so much qualification, he asserts, that "no physical ardor of this kind can be steadily maintained, or ought to be valued, as he seems to value it." If by "physical ardor" Evangelist is willing to be understood to mean a fervid condition, a high glow of the moral temperament, I will not dispute with him about terms, though I am not exactly accustomed to such a use of language. I have suspected, from this circumstance, that he has either misapprehended, or intends to misrepresent me. Or is it possible, that Evangelist has no experience, and no moral philosophy, by which he can appreciate a high and holy condition of the moral affections? I should be sorry, indeed, that I were engaged in dispute with a man, on the present question, to whom I should be obliged to say: 'Sir, I am not speaking of a high-wrought condition of the animal affections, nor of such transient and fitful excitements, as are produced by the revels of the drunkard.' Nor do I desire controversy with a man

who is determined to *solicit* the questions in agitation. For, if he means by "physical ardor," what I mean by a chastened religious enthusiasm, or first-love to Christ, he has got quite in the advance ground, by asserting, that such a condition of the moral affections cannot "be steadily maintained." I shall surely be discouraged, in being obliged to conflict with such gratuitous assumption. This, if I mistake not, is the very *pivot* on which the whole controversy turns.

I would recommend to the study of Evangelist two single and notable characters, which have been acted out before the world in real life, and which may be found in the history of St. Paul, and of the philanthropic and benevolent Howard. The former character is sufficiently well defined in the New-Testament. The latter I would present in the brief and inimitable description of Foster: "the calmness of an intensity, kept uniform by the nature of the human mind, forbidding it to be greater, and by the character of the individual, forbidding it to be less." And if Evangelist should say, these are *extraordinary* characters, I admit the *fact*, and aver, moreover, there is no necessity why they *should* be. There are abundant materials in every age, and in every community, which under the grace of God, are competent to exemplify equal moral energies, in a like unbroken career.

I was willing, Mr. Editor, to stand corrected by such generous spirits, as A—h—t and Alumnus, if my zeal in their estimation had carried me too far. They were willing to allow the *general* truth of my remarks. But, Sir, I will not consent to be driven entirely from this ground, by such logic as that of Evangelist.

That there *is* truth, and *much* truth in my original communication on this subject, I most cheer-

fully appeal to the experience and observation of every one, that is competent to speak upon this question, if he will set aside his interest, and speak the honest convictions of his heart. And I desire that this truth should be felt. It *must* be felt.

I profess myself the friend of learning and of Colleges. And I will prove it by urging their establishment upon the basis of Christianity. The Christian ministry must be filled from Colleges. And Colleges must be purified from their springs of unhallowed ambition. Or, if such a reformation be impracticable, I say again what I said in my former communication: "There is a loud and solemn demand for the church to rise, and assert her own rights, to do her own business, and secure her own objects."

ANTIPAS.

LARGE CITIES, NO. II.

THIS article is designed to do little more than introduce a subject for the consideration and labor of abler minds, or those who have more leisure or zeal to pursue it to a more practical result. The influence of the theatre upon the young was dwelt upon in my last number. I have now to present the same thing in a new light, as the principal source of crimes among juvenile offenders. We all know something of the influence of public opinion, and of the opinion of Christians when expressed with decision and unanimity, even when it goes against worldly interest or pleasure. The destruction of the slave trade in England is a striking fact in point. Who can doubt that if Christians would unitedly, firmly, and explicitly declare their abomination of these establishments, and their desire to have them wholly suppressed, the thing would be done? As a medium of collecting and concentrating and exhibiting the voice

of Christians, I would propose that they should circulate and sign and present petitions to the proper authorities, to have all theatres suppressed by law. Let the subject be taken up in every ministerial, charitable, and ecclesiastical meeting, and acted on in earnest and by concert, with a fixed resolution not to give over until every one of these sinks of profligacy is rooted out of the land. Every church and every Christian in the country has an interest more or less in this subject. The theatre is the source of a multitude of evils, whose influence is felt in our remotest hamlets. How many Christian parents have gone with sorrow to the grave, because a hopeful son was ruined by the theatre. And whose turn is it next? Who is free? How many a village, comparatively sober and moral, has been filled with dark corruption by some straggling journeyman, or pedlar, or blacklegs, from the purlieus of the theatre. What place has walls to keep out the plague?

But in order to move the public mind effectually on the subject, a multitude of facts must be presented continually. If the community could only be made to see the enormity of the evils that grow out of the allowance of theatres, they would demand their suppression, with a voice so loud and distinct as would make the halls of legislation tremble before the breath of public sentiment. My own mind was very forcibly impressed by reading the last report of the New-York Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents. The Society itself, both in its design and conduct, is above all praise. And the success of its measures is truly wonderful. Since the society commenced its operations, they have had under their care three hundred and seventy-seven youthful criminals and vagrants. Of these, one hundred and sixty-eight have been indentured with their own consent,

in almost all of whom the society receives satisfactory evidence of continued good conduct. There are now in their care one hundred and sixty-one. The rest have been disposed of in different ways,—as, sixteen returned to friends, twelve sent to the alms-house, thirteen of age, six permanent escapes, four deceased.

In examining the course of juvenile vice, the managers offer the following view of the influence of theatrical amusements.

“The motives to thieving are therefore those principally which lead to vicious gratifications of a social character. The thief is often prodigal of his money. He squanders it to purchase a transient enjoyment with boon companions. Whatever holds out to him this lure, excites his unprincipled passion, and plunges him into the vortex of habitual indulgence. Among these causes of vicious excitement in our city, none appear to be so powerful in their operation as theatrical amusements. The number of boys and young men who have become determined thieves in order to procure the means of introduction to the theatres and circuses, would appal the feelings of every virtuous mind, could the whole truth be laid open before them. A small sum is at first pilfered to obtain a single sight of amusements respecting which they hear so much, and of whose entertainments the street advertisements exhibit in such conspicuous and alluring characters. The first gratification prompts powerfully to the means of renewal,—new acquaintance is formed—the secrets of others still deeper in crime become known,—other passions are elicited—dishonesty and falsehood, once rendered habitual, and the vicious propensities of the mind gaining a complete ascendancy—the barriers of the law, and a regard for character, present no

further impediments, than a desire to evade the one and to conceal the abandonment of the other.

In the case of the feeble sex, the result is still worse. A relish for the amusements of the theatre, without the means of honest indulgence, becomes too often a motive for listening to the first suggestions of the seducer, and thus prepares the unfortunate captive of sensuality for the haunts of infamy, and a total destitution of all that is valuable in the mind and character of woman.

The two following cases, selected from the examination of the boys of the Refuge, by the Superintendent, will tend to corroborate the opinion entertained by the Managers that no greater evil could have befallen our city, in relation to the morals of its youth, than the extraordinary increase which has recently taken place in the number and variety of its theatres and other analogous places of public amusement. From the rivalry which prevails between these places, and the necessity of resorting to some means in order to sustain a reputation for numbers, the terms of admission are reduced to a modicum; and, if our information be correct, tickets of admission even in some of the largest of these establishments, are freely granted to that class of females which it is expected will be able to bring companions with them, and thus add to the emoluments and appearance of the house.

June 24th, 1827.

II—S—, from the Commissioners, by the intercession of his mother and friends, aged eleven years the third of March last, born in Yonkers, West-Chester county, N. Y. His father has been dead six or seven years, his mother keeps a boarding house, on the corner of B— and R— streets, is to pay one thousand dollars rent annually, and has twenty-seven boarders.

H— lived two years with his un-

cle R—— M——, at H**** N****, Conecticut; returned to his mother in September last.

His first theft was sixpence from his mother; the second was two shillings from her, with which he went to the Chatham Theatre, and told his mother that he had been playing with boys in the street; then six shillings from his mother, which he spent in going to the Bowery Theatre twice; next five dollars from his aunt H—— M——, of which he spent three dollars in going to the Park Theatre three times, and concealed the rest under his mother's back stoop; then four shillings from Miss J—— M——, which he spent in going to the Chatham Theatre, including ice cream, oranges, &c. &c.; then five dollars from Miss S——, one of his mother's boarders, spent three dollars, in going to the Bowery Theatre, and concealed the rest as before; next two dollars from Mrs. D——, which he hid under the back stoop as before; then ten dollars from his mother, spent the greatest part in going twice to the Chatham Theatre, put the balance as before under the back stoop. The object of his hiding these little amounts was, that he might have a sufficiency on the ensuing fourth of July."

The second case selected by the managers must be omitted on account of its length. It exhibits a surprising number of petty thefts and knaveries, from the purloining of small articles of furniture to the forging and swindling of considerable sums—the avails of which were generally spent at the theatre. The managers add that "his friends and himself all say that his great thirst for visiting theatres and places of amusement, was the leading passion which induced him to steal so much."

"It is not believed that these are very rare or very peculiar cases. The number of boys that occupy the lower seats of the theatres, and of those too whose ragged appearance indicates the poverty in which they live, is said to be very great; and the examinations of the Refuge would lead to the conclusion, that

these places are the resort almost universally of those, who, by the dishonesty of their lives, become candidates for the Refuge and City Prison. But it is much easier to point out these evils than to prescribe the remedy. It would not perhaps be extravagant to assert, that were the theatres and circuses made to contribute an amount equal to the maintenance of the city prison, they would do no more than compensate for the extent of the moral evil which they entail upon the inferior classes of our population."

WOULD IT BE BEST, IN PRACTICABLE CASES, FOR THE CHURCH TO DEFRAY THE ENTIRE EXPENSE OF A PREACHED GOSPEL AMONG THEM?

THAT there are instances in which this is easily practicable I have no doubt; and that the instances are quite numerous in our favored country at the present time in which it might be done with less of a spirit of self-denial and liberality than was generally exhibited by the primitive churches for the same object, appears equally clear. But would it be best, on the whole, to have it done? If so, I should think the time arrived for beginning to revive that primitive practice.

There have not been wanting men of the first respectability for talents, learning, and piety, to advocate this plan.* It is said, with great truth, that the church ought to feel and to exhibit before the world such a spirit of liberality as this would require. It is also said, that such a mode of supporting this institution would operate as a preventive to the settlement of heretical and lax ministers among us, and the introduction of worldly-minded men as private members in our churches. It is also added, that

* Dr. Dwight for instance.

the church was never so greatly and truly prosperous as when such was the order of things. It is likewise predicted, by some, that the time is approaching when such must again be the order of things, whether we prefer and voluntarily seek it or not.

These topics of argument appear sufficient, both in number and importance, to claim a fair consideration of the main question. But weighty as they are, they do not appear to me sufficient for its decision. As I have never met with any arguments on the other side, (except that of *necessity*, which does not reach the question as I have stated it,) I will now briefly adduce such as have occurred to my reflections.

1. It does not appear that either Christ or the apostles ever intimated the impropriety of all men's contributing to the support of a preached gospel—or of their doing it by tax or any other mode which they might prefer.

2. I cannot learn that the primitive churches ever rejected any such aid when proffered.

3. The corruption of the ministry in early and later ages, is rather to be traced to the interference than to the pecuniary aid of rulers and worldly men. Let the monarch become, *ex officio*, the "head of the church," as formerly at Christianized Rome, or now in England, and we may soon expect to see him corrupt the church by the introduction of a vicious priesthood. So, too, will there be no small danger if a congregation, in any place, are to have the sole voice in electing a minister. But let the church retain her distinct voice, and even take the lead in every such transaction, as I believe has generally been the wise and cautious practice in New-England, and I see no material increase of danger from the aid and the requisite concurring voice of the congregation. If the latter are to afford their pecuniary aid in the

support of a minister, or the erection of a place of worship, Christian principle as well as common courtesy and sound wisdom, would readily ask their *voluntary* concurrence, and yield to their negative. But it ought ever to be deemed of great importance in the sacred transaction of settling a minister, that our churches should not only have a *distinct* voice, but that they should continue to take the lead. This may prevent unhappy collisions between a church and society, as well as the far more important evil; for then, if the church do not see fit to elect the candidate, the object is dropped without collision, as the society are not called officially to act. It is with much regret and some alarm that recent departures from this customary order have been witnessed. So long as it shall be preserved, the church need not be driven to separate from the society, (as in some recent cases in Massachusetts,) nor to receive a pastor whom they cannot welcome.

4. It is of at least as much importance to the wicked as to the righteous, that the gospel should continue to be preached. It is therefore right that they should aid in supporting its institutions. Even in a temporal view, it repays a hundred fold its own expense. And without its regular ministration, their prospect of salvation is faint indeed.

5. By far the chief reason why I think it desirable that all should bear a part in supporting the gospel, is the prospect of benefit to the individuals who thus contribute. The same man will be much more likely to attend on a preached gospel, and to be benefitted by it when he does attend, if he contributes to its support, than if he does not. Something might be said in support of this position from the common principles of our nature. That which costs us nothing, we are wont

to undervalue and neglect. But I refer principally for its confirmation to experience and observation. It is not a common thing among us to witness the attendance of those on the public means of grace who pay nothing to their support; and much less common, that we see the signs of their profiting by such attendance. On the other hand, those who, in addition to their proportionate tax, have four or five miles to travel in order to enjoy the sanctuary, are often not only the most constant, but also the most attentive and benefitted hearers. They feel that they cannot afford the expense of so much time and money for nothing. It is also worthy of emphatic remark, that societies *completely* endowed with funds for the support of the gospel, have often speedily decayed or become corrupt, or both. I should indeed think it well for every society to provide itself, in the days of its strength, with funds to such an amount, that, in case of adversity from any cause, it need not become a waste place in our Zion: but I should rather the money might be poured into the sea, than that a *complete* provision should thus be made to defray all parish expenses. It would annihilate interest and energy, and sink the hill of Zion into a stagnant, putrid lake. The same effects, in a degree, would be likely to result, should the mass of those who are not members of the church cease to pay any thing for the support of a minister, or to have any voice in his election. He would not be *their* minister, nor they *his* people; nor would he be so likely to care for them, or they for him, or for the gospel he should preach.

6. There still remains ample scope and the most pressing demand for all the "self-denial and liberality of the church." This is found in the perishing necessities of the heathen world, the Mahometan world, and the Popish world.

The aid which the church may receive in the temporal support of her institutions at home, let her repay in spreading the gospel abroad. Thus will she best imitate those precious primitive churches to which she looks up for example. They were at least as conspicuous for their liberality abroad as at home. The missionary spirit, breathed into their first existence by those "missionaries" whom Christ sent forth to "preach the gospel to every creature," glowed fervid among them for several ages. And these were those ages in which she enjoyed her best prosperity, and exhibited her light so pure and so honorable. Let the church at the present day feel this spirit, and exhibit this expansive liberality, and her light will soon go forth as brightness, and her salvation as a lamp that burneth.

We rejoice to witness the rapid increase of this truly primitive spirit, and hail it as the best harbinger of our age. Let those churches which can receive no voluntary aid from the world in supporting the preaching of the true gospel among them, not shrink from assuming the whole burden. It will be highly honorable; and God will bless them, and speedily grant them enlargement. But it will be still more honorable, because savoring less of selfishness, should the churches which enjoy this extraneous aid exhibit a commensurate liberality in spreading the gospel abroad. I verily believe there are but few churches in New-England which could not support their own institutions alone, if called to it, and if *fully* possessed of the *right* spirit. How numerous then are the flourishing churches in our happy land, blessed as they now are in their connexion with large and opulent societies, which might singly support a missionary abroad. How honorable would this be to themselves—how glorious to the cause

of Christ—how acceptable to the Saviour, if done for his glory—and how would it secure his favor which is life, and his loving-kindness which is better than life. How remarkably, in fact, has he blessed of late those few churches who *have* either done this, or what is equivalent to it: witness, for example, the evangelical churches in Boston.

V.

SKETCHES OF SOUTH AMERICA.

March 1. It is now time of Lent, and consequently a time of unremitted religious observances among Catholics. I have just returned from a visit to the Convent of St. Francis, and that of St. Dominick. At the former, about fifty aged monks were singing Latin hymns in honor of the Virgin, each of them holding an enormous naked candle, whose light set off, with fine effect, the pictures, images, and other drapery of this dark monastery.

At the chapel of St. Dominick, I found, in addition to the monks, a collection of citizens, of both sexes, and that one of the brotherhood was about to deliver a sermon. The speaker was already in his little pulpit, (an obscure, insignificant thing in a Catholic church, compared with the altar,) and soon commenced with a short address calling attention to the object of their meeting, viz. the worship of God in this solemn season of Lent. This exordium was followed by a prayer, at first slow, then faster and louder, and accompanied with the voices of both sexes and of every age until all was unintelligible jargon, at least to protestant ears.

The preacher's text surprised me. It was from Hebrews iv. 12. "For the word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword," &c. The "word of God" has here, no doubt, a prin-

cipal reference to the sacred Scriptures, in whose quickness and power, I supposed the Dominicans had more fears than confidence, and wondered at his selecting it as the theme of his discourse. He took the passage, however, in its widest sense, not meaning the Scriptures simply, nor even the preached word, but the Christian religion, whose "power" had been often exemplified by the lives, and particularly by the miracles of the saints. There were some pleasing and correct thoughts suggested in the course of the sermon, and with more apparent seriousness than I had before witnessed in the South American pulpit. He dwelt with a mixture of complaint and severe rebuke on the neglect of religious worship which widely prevailed. Many it would seem were but occasional observers of *mass*, and were wholly regardless of the duty of *confession*, as well as guilty of a general want of zeal and even respect for the interests of the church. This charge of disrespect towards religious observances, is reiterated by every preacher, and from what I have heard and seen, there is ground enough for the charge. Among political men, officers of the army, and in some instances among the priesthood itself, are witnessed marks of skepticism. In no individual, however, have I noticed that deep malicious hatred against Christianity which so generally accompanies the infidelity of England and our own country.

Popery is too accommodating towards the pleasures and peccancies of men, to awaken their hostility. The system is simply disbelieved as being of divine origin, but still is "considered well enough for monks, women, and children, and therefore to be countenanced." It requires little sagacity to see, that were the plain, pungent truths of the New Testament brought out and applied, by some Luther or

John Knox, to the consciences of these good-natured doubters, they would soon add open opposition to their present tame unbelief. That there should be skepticism in a country where the Bible itself is rarely seen, and imperfectly expounded, and where there are so many ignorant priests, and so much unmeaning ceremony, is no matter of surprise.

On leaving the chapel, I passed through the various departments of the convent, calling on several of the inmates, and paying a formal visit to the aged Prior, with whom I had previously formed some little acquaintance. The Prior is connected with one of the oldest and most distinguished families of Chile, and is in point of intelligence far superior to any monk which I have met. He has borne with a reluctant assent all the changes of the revolution, but has recently uttered loud remonstrances against a threatened seizure of the monastic estates by the new authorities. As I was a disinterested foreigner, his abuses and the misconduct of government were, of course, spread before me, but without awakening in me all the sympathies which he wished. I was readily disposed to pity those of his brethren who, at an advanced age, were threatened with poverty as well as neglect, but had no such feeling towards those who were in the season of vigor, and might be separately employed in teaching the ignorant in the remote parts of the country. The door was now open for him to inquire how the priesthood were employed and supported in my own country, and on which topic I was glad to give him information. That our clergy could preach two and three sermons on a sabbath; that they were supported without the aid of government; and that they had each a *wife* and children, were three such mysteries as the prior seemed not recently to have encountered.

This convent was built at great expense, being spread over an entire square of the city, and having apartments for more than two hundred monks. There are now, however, but twelve of these apartments which contain living beings, while a few old pictures and crosses occupy, in gloomy solitude, the remainder. The two courts of this cloister are very spacious, neatly paved, and planted with orange trees, and around each is extended a piazza of ten or twelve feet in width. Along the walls of these piazzas are hung a great number and variety of paintings, most of them of large size, and intended to illustrate the life and miracles of St. Dominick.

This saint, who was born in 1170, was, as you know, the celebrated founder of the Inquisition, and in whose life prodigies are of course to be looked for. Near the entrance of the outer court is hung a painting ten or twelve feet square, which exhibits him when a small child in company with his mother and other relatives, who seem by their looks and attentions to have had a presentiment of his future greatness. An adjoining picture exhibits this individual at the age of manhood, when he had assumed the cassock, and was in the act of performing a stupendous miracle. The monk stands on a huge rock by the side of the ocean, at a time when that element is lashed with storm, and threatening to swallow up the numerous distressed vessels which are in sight. One vessel has already been dashed against the rocks, and its fragments are floating on the billows. The crew, however, together with a large mastiff and some other domestics of the ship, with eyes steadily fixed on the monk, are swimming safely to land, and even the distant vessels are beginning, it would seem, to feel the salutary influence of his interposition.

A third picture, of still greater dimensions, represents the saint as surrounded by a collection of believers, while on another part of the canvass is a company of heretics, and a huge direful drawing of satan, with wings, scales, a fiery forked tongue, and barbed tail. The heretics and their infernal leader are fleeing in dismay; and the design is to show that they have been driven out from the presence of the faithful by the mandate and uplifted hand of St. Dominick.

Another painting represents him as raising a dying man to life and health; though in this miracle, the presence of the virgin Mary indicates that the monk ascribes his supernatural power to her imparted aid.

Another picture of immense size (passing over many unnoticed) exhibits the death and funeral procession of this renowned bigot and cruel instrument of popery. In this long procession appear cardinals, bishops, and priests of every grade, and monks of every order, in their respective costumes. Here too appear the *Inquisitors*, whose bloody office this monk created. These judges of conscience, and ministers of death, are clothed in a black silk coat and small clothes, with white silk hose, and bear on their breasts a red cross, and by their side a menacing sword—not of “the spirit,” but of glittering steel.

Having no heart to survey longer these abominations of a perverted religion, I left the gloomy cloister of St. Dominick, and hastened to my lodgings.

March 3. As little is now passing in Santiago except what has

connexion with Lent, I have to-day been induced to visit another convent, that of St. Augustine. I was invited to make this visit by one who is a lay-brother in this establishment, and a school teacher in the house where I reside. He assured me that I was to hear an interesting sermon. His assurances however were not verified. The discourse, in point of talent, was inferior to the one I heard at St. Dominick, and in spirit almost inquisitorial. Some part of the discourse created a suspicion that the speaker had a marked reference to myself, as he often fixed his eye on me and anathematized those who had forsaken the mother church, calling them “*los Calvinistas y otras sectas infernales.*” This convent has about forty inmates, few of which, it is feared, possess much of the intelligence and spirit of him whose name it bears.

Preaching is now heard every day throughout the season of Lent, and this is, in most places, made to suffice for all the rest of the year, with the exception of a few anniversary days of distinguished saints. I learn, however, that this exercise is more frequent in Chile than in Buenos Ayres—indeed that there is in one chapel a sermon on almost every Sabbath evening. Yet it is still evident that the business of preaching is *here* but a secondary duty; while that of reading a Latin mass is considered the great work of the priesthood, and, with confession and penance, the means of salvation to a gay and thoughtless people.

(To be continued.)

REVIEWS.

The Christian Bishop approving himself unto God, in reference to the present state of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: A Sermon preached in Christ's Church in the city of Philadelphia, on Thursday, the 25th day of October, A D. 1827, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. Henry U. Onderdonk, D. D. as Assistant Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Pennsylvania. By JOHN HENRY HOBART, D. D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New-York. Philadelphia, 1827, 8vo. pp. 36.

Rev Mr. McIlvaine in Answer to the Rev. Henry U. Onderdonk D. D. Philadelphia, 1827. 8vo. pp. 43.

IT is known to our readers that for many years past there has been among the Episcopalians of this country a serious difference of opinion and of feeling. Two opposing parties have been gradually formed corresponding in most points with the two great parties which divide the established church of England. The "High church" party, with Arminian views of Christian doctrine, with Roman Catholic notions of the efficacy of sacraments administered by proper hands, and with the exclusiveness of feeling which constrains them most devoutly to eschew the contamination of any contact with "dissenters," constitute probably a considerable majority among the Episcopalians of both countries. The "Low church" or "Evangelical" party on the other hand, with a theology conformed to the thirty-nine articles, with more protestant opinions about the nature of church ordinances, and with more

liberality in regard to Christian intercourse with other denominations, make up, to some extent, in effort what they want in numbers and in the means of influence.

It is known too that within a few months the difference between these parties, has broken out into an open and earnest controversy. In the election of an Assistant Bishop for the Diocese of Pennsylvania, the Convention was equally divided, and after a long course of electioneering and management (which each party we believe ascribes wholly to the other) the High-Churchmen carried the day, and the Rev. Henry U. Onderdonk of Brooklyn in New-York was chosen by a bare majority over the Rev. William Meade of Virginia. The successive steps of this affair appear to have occasioned a great many pamphlets on both sides of the question, only a few of which have fallen under our immediate inspection. But we have seen enough and heard enough to convince our minds that the peculiar circumstances of this controversy seem to bear inauspiciously not only on the sectarian interests of that particular denomination but also on the cause of truth and godliness.

Let not this language be quoted as implying any disapprobation of the course adopted by the evangelical Episcopalians of Pennsylvania. All our feelings and prepossessions in this matter are with them, and we have known nothing which ought to impair our confidence in their Christian spirit or their Christian discretion. We mean only that the controversy is too local and occasional and personal. Such a dispute necessarily calls into exercise every dangerous feeling, and the longer it is continued.

unless it passes to the discussion of abstract principles, the more fierce and loud and fiery will it become. The questions, whether Dr. Onderdonk was lawfully elected bishop—whether the Rev. Mr. Carter had a right to vote in the convention—whether Bishop Hobart is more aspiring or more lordly than becomes a prelate—whether the Rev. Mr. Allen is uncourteous in his attacks upon the diocesan of New-York;—may be disputed always and never be any nearer to a conclusion than at the beginning. But the uselessness of such a controversy is the least evil attending it. Such a controversy almost necessarily becomes a quarrel, begetting hard names, and bitterness and wrath and clamour, till the enemies of God and of his church take up the shout of exultation. But the questions whether the native moral corruption of man is partial or entire—whether the purposes of God extend to all events, or only to now and then a particular occurrence—whether regeneration is a change of the inmost heart wrought by the Spirit, or only a change of visible relations effected by baptism—whether a revival of religion is an unhallowed and ungodly human artifice, or an outpouring of celestial influences—whether to join with Christians of various names in efforts for a common Christian object is right or wrong—are questions of another sort. These questions are of wide and permanent importance; they are connected with all the vital interests of Christianity; and a controversy on such points might easily be so conducted as to confirm the truth and to force it on the conviction of the public mind. And therefore it is that we regret the necessity which has given the controversy its present shape, bringing forward so many personal and occasional questions, and more than half diverting the public attention from those far greater

questions which constitute the original ground of variance.

The pamphlet of Mr. M'Ilvaine affords a fair illustration of our meaning. This pamphlet is a personal vindication of the author from certain charges preferred against him by the gentleman who is now co-bishop of Pennsylvania. A new episcopal congregation had been formed in Rochester, and had made overtures to Mr. M'Ilvaine to become their pastor. This proposed arrangement Dr. Onderdonk was desirous of defeating; and therefore wrote a letter half-private and half-public to a gentleman of his acquaintance in that village, putting the people on their guard "respecting that gentleman"—as "one of the most decided of low, or rather half-churchmen"—as "a great opponent of Bishop Hobart"—as "a zealous promoter of the schemes that would blend" Episcopalians "with Presbyterians"—as having been "educated at the Presbyterian Seminary at Princeton"—as having "worn out his popularity" at both the places at which he has heretofore labored in the ministry—as being according to the "current idea" "the reverse of pleasing in his general and pastoral intercourse"—and as having in his sermons, notwithstanding his high reputation, "more show than substance." This letter, though addressed in form to an individual, was of course considered as designed to enlighten the minds and to direct the proceedings of the vestry of the newly organized congregation, and was therefore communicated to the members of that body. It thus became a matter of considerable notoriety; it found its way into the public journals; it was circulated far and near; and finally, as we gather from Mr. M.'s reply, a pamphlet was published in defence of Dr. O.'s proceeding as an act entirely proper. In these circumstances Mr. M. felt that by

a regard for his own character and usefulness he was compelled to vindicate himself from the charges which had been urged against him so seriously, which were sustained by the authority of so great a dignitary, and which had gained so wide a circulation. And while he has vindicated himself most triumphantly, he has done it—we are happy to say—with a meekness and kindness of spirit which few men would be able to exhibit under such provocation. We must go to the region of political electioneering to find an instance in which a man claiming to be respectable has descended to a course of conduct parallel to the part which Dr. O. has sustained in this history, as it appears in detail. For the details we refer our readers to the statement in the pamphlet. The conduct of the bishop elect taken together, seems to be very much like what the Bible calls “back-biting;” and if we are not much imposed upon, it affords a striking and rather singular illustration of Dr. Hobart’s strong language where he speaks of men who, with all their religious professions, “shun not those artifices which even the world loathes and reprobates.” But triumphant as Mr. M’Ilvaine’s effort at self-vindication proves to be, and Christian-like as is the spirit with which he has borne himself in this matter, we read his performance not without a deep regret that instead of seeing him thus engaged in a mere skirmish, warding off the shafts hurled at him from a petty ambuscade, we do not see him contending with the enemy upon the open field of argument for the great truths and principles which are in fact at issue. And this regret is heightened when, as we read the few pages where he treats of the difference in principle between the parties, we see the ability with which he might quit himself in such a conflict.

Bishop Hobart being invited to preach at the “consecration” of Dr. Onderdonk, felt himself called—and indeed it would be difficult to specify the occasion when he has not felt himself called—to set forth and defend the peculiarities of his sect; not merely the peculiarities of his church, but the peculiarities of the “high-church” party in the Episcopal communion. The Sermon has obtained no inconsiderable notoriety in consequence of its having been regarded as an unkind, and, in view of the circumstances in which it was delivered, an outrageous attack upon those who, in the exercise of their Christian and ecclesiastical rights, had opposed the election, and had protested against the consecration of the man whom at that time and in that place the preacher was investing with authority over them. But it is not on that account that we have chosen to notice it on our pages; for, as we have already hinted, we deem it inexpedient for us to enter minutely into that controversy. We notice it only because it contains a more summary and on most points a more explicit exposure of high-church principles than we remember to have seen in any other publication.

Dr. Hobart’s text is “Study to show thyself approved unto God.” After a brief and appropriate introduction, he announces his subject thus.

“Study to show thyself approved unto God. *in the faithful discharge of duty, as demanded by the particular circumstances and exigencies of our church.*” p. 8.

Under this general subject the preacher has thirteen specifications of the duty of a Bishop in the present circumstances and exigencies of the Episcopal church. Of these specifications, our limits and a due regard to the patience of our readers will permit us to notice only a few.

The first head of the discourse treats of the duty of "faithfully preaching the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel." "A failure in so doing," says Dr. H. "is one of those charges which, from whatever motive, is [query are ?] often urged against a portion, at least, of the bishops and clergy of our church. Wo, indeed, be to them if they thus neglect to teach and to enforce those vital doctrines, which alone can give efficacy to the Gospel." Then, after remarking that in determining how he shall preach the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel he must study to approve himself unto God rather than to secure the good opinion of men, our author proceeds as follows.

No love of applause, as the advocate of what is miscalled liberal and rational Christianity; and no fear of censure for opposing what, by a strange anomaly, are sometimes distinguished as the doctrines of grace; will prompt him, on the one hand, to make man, the gold of whose nature has become dim, as bright and pure as when his maker's image was impressed on his soul; nor, on the other, to degrade that image, in native hatred of God and goodness, to the likeness of a fiend, and so to bind man in the chains of his corrupt passions, as to fix his crimes and his final perdition on the God of purity and boundless goodness. On the one hand, he will not wrest from the divine justice its sceptre, and from the divine government its sanctions, by extending pardon to sin without the vindication of that offended justice, or reparation to that insulted government; nor, on the other, limit that atonement to God's violated justice and sovereignty, which is more than of value for the salvation of millions of worlds, to but a small portion of the ruined race who require it. On the one hand, he will not represent man's powers and affections as standing in no need of the invisible and incomprehensible but transforming power of supernatural grace; nor, on the other, will he exhibit this spiritual death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness,

as effected but by the application of human reason and human resolution, guided and sanctified by the influence of the divine spirit secretly but powerfully dispensed in the use of moral means and external pledges. pp. 8, 9.

We would hope the Bishop's meaning is not so bad as his language seems to represent it. Obviously he does mean first, that the bishops and inferior ministers of the Episcopal Church must not inculcate Unitarianism; and secondly, that they must not preach what are called "the doctrines of grace." And we would gladly believe—if we could—that this is all which he means. But he *says* much more than this. Let us look at his language.

1. His language means that the advocates "of what is miscalled liberal and rational Christianity"—that is the Unitarians—"make man, the gold of whose nature has become dim, as bright and pure as when his Maker's image was impressed on his soul." Now we are no friends to Unitarianism; but upon the principle of giving to all their due, we must say that we doubt whether any one of them will acknowledge this as a just description of their opinion. They hold—as we understand them—that man has by nature no character at all—that each human being forms a character for himself—and that, without any man's being entirely bad or entirely "bright and pure," some men are better and others are worse. If it can be proved that any respectable Unitarian in this country—respectable we mean among his own friends—believes and preaches that man is thus "bright and pure," we will acknowledge that we have been over-charitable in forming our judgment of their opinions.

2. The only positive "doctrine of original corruption" which is

hinted at as true, is that "the gold of man's nature has become dim." Without showing how far short this is of that fearful energy of expression with which the Bible speaks of human depravity; we would only ask whether there is in fact any desperate discrepancy between this doctrine and the corresponding doctrine in the system of "liberal and rational Christianity."

3. The language which the bishop uses means that those who hold what are "distinguished as the doctrines of grace" are guilty of injustice towards the image of God which is impressed on the native character of man;—that they "degrade that image, in native hatred of God and goodness, to the likeness of a fiend, and so bind man in the chains of his corrupt passions as to fix his crimes and his final perdition on the God of purity and boundless goodness." Whom he intends to designate, when he thus speaks of "the doctrines of grace" is as evident and unquestionable as it is whom he intends to point out by the periphrasis—"advocates of what is miscalled liberal and rational Christianity." The phrase "doctrines of grace" has acquired a meaning distinctive of a certain system of opinions—a meaning which, unless it be explained and guarded, it conveys to every mind. It means what is called the "Evangelical system" of opinions and of preaching. It means not only the views of the "Low-church" party in Bishop Hobart's own denomination, but the views of the great body of the Presbyterian Congregational and Baptist churches in these United States. All these Christians, constituting the vast majority of the professed disciples of our Lord in this land, are thus charged, in one sweeping sentence with degrading God's image in the human heart to the likeness of a fiend, and with so binding man in the chains of his corrupt passions as to fix his

crimes and his final perdition upon God.

This representation we deem worthy of a little attention. If it were a solitary charge uttered by a single individual, it might be worthy of notice as proceeding from the great leader of Episcopal Arminianism in this country, and as having been given to the public on an occasion not only of great solemnity in itself, but made more solemn by the interest of peculiar circumstances. It is not, however, a solitary charge. It is connected with an extended system of misrepresentation. And it is in this light—as a specimen of the mode in which the evangelical doctrine of human corruption is very widely treated by men who dare not meet it fairly and fairly contradict it—as a specimen sanctioned by a Right Reverend name and gaining circulation, if not currency, from the interest of a great occasion—that we deem it worthy of a little attention. In just this way, the Orthodox, the Presbyterian, the Congregational, the Evangelical doctrine of depravity is represented by a multitude of tongues and pens on all occasions. And by such representations so often repeated the minds of many, particularly the indiscriminating and unthinking, are seriously prejudiced against the truth. Misrepresentation and declamation are not unfrequently successful where no honest argument could be constructed.

Now what is the doctrine which the Bishop of New-York thus denounces? What is the "doctrine of grace" on the subject of human depravity? It is simply this—the doctrine that man is *by nature* the subject of an *entire moral* corruption. This is the doctrine of depravity which is preached from evangelical pulpits, which is set forth and vindicated in evangelical publications, and which mingles itself with all the prayers and confes-

sions of evangelical believers. Often have we heard this doctrine preached; and always do we hear it announced in language such as that which we have now used.

Into the proof of this doctrine we do not design to enter. Our only purpose is to show what is the doctrine, and to compare it with the description given by the Bishop. In showing what the doctrine is, we shall just attempt to show how evangelical preachers explain it in their sermons. And we hardly think that Dr. Hobart, or any other misrepresenter of Calvinism, will affirm that, when they have heard the doctrine preached, the preacher has not shown first what the doctrine does not mean, and secondly what it does mean; or that these two heads of discourse were not treated in some such manner as the following.

This doctrine does *not* mean that men are as bad as they can be: For nobody has ever denied that all men, not excepting perhaps the very worst, are capable of progression in wickedness. Nor does it mean that men have not a great many civil and social virtues: For it is a fact obvious to common observation, coincident with the representations of Scripture, and never contradicted, that to man as a being sustaining certain domestic and social and civil relations, there pertain certain corresponding affections and principles of judgment. Nor does it mean that men are not voluntary in their transgressions: For the fact that men are moral agents is one of those principles of belief the denial of which is insanity;—and however some men, by injudicious modes of speech, or by ill-contrived theories, may seem to have implied a contradiction of this fundamental truth, they all insist upon this truth, and all take it for granted as a thing too obvious to be questioned.

On the contrary, this corruption

is called a *moral* depravity. It is maintained to be a corruption of the heart and spirit—a corruption of will and purpose and action. There are indeed those who suppose that the consequences of the apostasy include a degradation of the intellectual and physical powers of human nature, as well as of the moral character. But even these regard that intellectual and physical degradation as the result, and in part the punishment of this moral corruption. All who hold “the doctrines of grace,” unite in maintaining, under one form or another, that the guilt of the sinner is his own.

This corruption is maintained to be a depravity by *nature*, in opposition to the opinion of those who ascribe all the wickedness of men to education, or example, or accidental circumstances; and who believe that the character of sinfulness is formed by the operation of such causes at some period after the commencement of moral action. It is a depravity by nature, inasmuch as it is a corruption of character belonging to every man from the commencement of his accountable existence up to the time when the grace of God arrests him and makes him a new creature.

This corruption is held to be *entire*, in opposition to the notion that there are in the moral character of man some remaining principles of obedience to God—that there is some spark which needs only to be fanned and fed, some affection which may be improved and cherished till it becomes the holiness which God requires. The doctrine of *total* depravity—to call it by a name which exposes it to every prejudice—is neither more nor less than this, that there is in the character of man till he is born of God, nothing of the nature of holiness—no principle of conduct, no affection, which, be it ever so much cultivated, and refined, and strengthen-

ed, will bear any true resemblance to that holiness which God demands of every moral being, and which his grace has implanted in the renovated soul.

The meaning of our doctrine then rests very much upon the import which we attach to the word *holiness*. What do we understand by this word? We understand it to mean the willing subjection of the soul to the authority of God. Holiness is the submission of the inmost spirit to that fundamental law in the government of Jehovah, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." It is the preference of the will of God to all things else, adopted as the supreme choice of the mind, the ultimate principle of action. This is holiness; and whether holiness be perfect or imperfect, it is the same principle, the supreme preference of the will of God. Perfect holiness is where this principle is not only supreme, but is unwavering in its influence, and is brought to bear in all its ascendancy on every act and purpose of the mind. Imperfect holiness is where the same commanding purpose exists, but without that unwavering energy, and with a less uniform application to the conduct. This supreme preference of the will of God is always the principle of holiness; and where this is wanting—however graceful and amiable may be the play of human passions—however acute and controlling the sense of character—however keen the vibrations of restless and wounded conscience—however precise the attendance on all the externals of religion—*there* is no obedience to God, and nothing like it; and there (it is no exaggeration to say) is entire moral corruption in the sight of infinite purity. And more; where this principle of holiness is wanting, *there* is of course the principle of all rebellion against God, there is

the preference of self-gratification to the will of the Eternal, there is the spirit which, when the will of God is distinctly felt to thwart its controlling purpose of self-gratification, has within it—can have within it—no principle but that of opposition, and resistance, and enmity.

Respecting this doctrine—the doctrine of the entire moral corruption of human nature—Bishop Hobart affirms that in maintaining it we degrade man "to the likeness of a fiend;" or in plain words, that we make men as bad as devils. And this is the charge which is urged against evangelical Christians from all quarters. This charge the tippler belches forth over his cups, stammering curses against Calvinism. This charge the gamester, and the swearer, and all the sons of Belial, urge in concert. This charge the Unitarian echoes in more courtly periods from the pulpit and the press. And lo! the lawn-sleeved bishop takes up the charge and fulminates it from his "throne." Will this master and teacher in Israel bear with us while we ask, What mean you by this charge? We degrade man to the likeness of a fiend! We make men as bad as devils! What does such an assertion mean? If it is a mere unmeaning flourish of words, designed to waken prejudice and to turn aside the edge of truth, we say—and we desire to say it solemnly, as in the name of conscience and of God—let every man beware how he deludes the souls of sinners by an artifice so paltry. If he means by fiends those beings whom the Bible describes as the angels who kept not their first estate, and whom God hath reserved in chains under darkness to the judgment of the great day,—then we beg him to remember that he knows nothing of these beings but what the Bible tells us; and that the Bible describes them not as the long-horned

cloven-footed monsters of a nursery tale, but rather as Milton has conceived them—

“Angels ruin’d, and the excess
Of glory obscured :”

And we call upon him to collect every thing which the Bible has told us respecting the character of sinful angels ; and when the description is complete, then to set down by its side all that the Scriptures say about the character of sinful and unrepenting men, and tell us which picture is delineated with the broadest outline, and which is the fullest and blackest with its hues of guilt. Do we hear the charge again, that we degrade man to the likeness of a fiend ? The argument is only *ad invidiam*. It is nothing to the purpose. The only question is, whether we make men worse than the Bible makes them, or worse than they are in fact. But we deny the imputation. We believe that the opposition which the devils maintain against their Maker is just what the opposition of wicked men *will be* when, stripped of the restraints and counteracting passions of their social nature, they shall come to the same place of torment—more undisguised, more systematic, more desperate, more intense, than the enmity which lurks in any carnal mind on earth. At the same time we believe also—and the Bible bears us out in the opinion—that the principle of opposition to God, the supreme preference of self-gratification, is the same in wicked angels and in wicked men.

But another charge is urged against us. Dr. Hobart says, that we “so bind man in the chains of his corrupt passions as to fix his crimes and his final perdition on the God of purity and boundless goodness.” How ? Before the charge is repeated, let the accuser pause, and think if he can tell us how. Do we maintain—as our author has done on some for-

mer occasion—that the depravity of men is ‘their misfortune and not their crime ?’ If we did, we might find the charge a difficult one to be refuted. On the other hand, do we not maintain that man in all his perverseness is a voluntary rebel, the free perpetrator of his own transgressions, and thus the author of his own perdition ? How then do we fix his crimes and his perdition on the God of purity and love ?

We have spoken on this subject thus at length, because we regard it as a topic of primary importance in the controversy with the anti-evangelical portion of the Episcopal church, and because, as we have already intimated, calumny is every where so loud and busy in misrepresenting “the doctrines of grace” on this particular point. Our limits compel us to omit some inquiries and suggestions which we had designed to make respecting our author’s statement of “divine atonement.” We proceed therefore to consider his view of the “fundamental doctrine” of “spiritual renovation.”

4. Bishop Hobart’s *language* means that “man’s powers,” as well as his “affections,” “stand in need of” “the transforming power of supernatural grace.” If this is true, if man’s powers, as distinguished from his affections, are not such as qualify him to render obedience to God, then he is by every principle of justice exempted from the claims of God’s moral government ; for God’s moral government is a government over moral agents, and a moral agent who has not the power of obeying is a thing impossible. If the Bishop is disposed to deny that this is his meaning, we say again that this is what his language means ; and when he is thus summarily treating the most metaphysical and controverted subjects in theology, how are we to know his meaning but by a strict interpretation of his language ?

5. His language is, that the

"spiritual death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness is not effected but by the application of human reason and human resolution, guided and sanctified by the influences of the Divine Spirit." What this *means* may be somewhat doubtful. If it means—as at the first glance it seems to mean—that man is the prime mover in his own conversion, with some guiding and sanctifying assistance from the Divine Spirit; it is as contradictory to what the preacher has just said about what "man's powers and affections" stand in need of, as it is difficult to be reconciled with the whole current of Scripture language. If it means—as it may perhaps be construed—that the Divine Spirit moving by his own sovereign will directs the mind and will of the sinner, and brings him to God; it is indeed accordant with what the Bible says—"Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" and we have only to regret that the author has expressed himself so equivocally, and especially that he has encumbered and nullified his meaning with the additional clause which we now proceed to notice.

6. Our author's language means that the influences of the Divine Spirit are "dispensed" only "in the use of moral means and external pledges." In order to understand this fully, the reader who is not familiar with the language of High-church theology, needs to examine a little the second head of the discourse where the preacher speaks on the duty of "exhibiting the [Episcopal] church in its divinely *constituted ministrations and ordinances* as the mean and pledge of salvation to the faithful." He there lays it down as a "doctrine" equally scriptural and philosophical "that the ministrations and ordinances of the church are the means and pledges of salvation to the faithful," in other words, that "spiritu-

al blessings are conveyed and pledged by external symbols." What then is the "doctrine" of spiritual renovation which our author's language inculcates? Why, that this spiritual renovation is not "effected but by the application of human reason and human resolution guided and sanctified by the influences of the Divine Spirit" "dispensed in the use of" the "divinely constituted ministrations and ordinances" of the Episcopal church. The "moral means" are the preaching of the divinely ordained ministers, and the liturgy and fasts and festivals of this divinely constituted church; and the "external pledges" are the sacraments administered by divinely authorised hands. It is in the use of these "moral means and external pledges" that the influences of the Divine Spirit are dispensed to guide and sanctify human reason and human resolution applied to effect the spiritual death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness. And in this way only is that spiritual renovation effected. Can it be that this author is a bishop of the *Protestant* Episcopal church? Or have we misunderstood him? Let us look again. What is his language? "*Nor* will he"—the bishop who studies to approve himself to God—"exhibit this spiritual death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness as effected *but* by the application of human reason and human resolution guided and sanctified by the influences of the Divine Spirit" "dispensed"—how?—"secretly but powerfully dispensed in the use of moral means and external pledges." "Spiritual blessings" "are exhibited as **CONVEYED** and **PLEDGED** by external symbols." "The ministrations and ordinances of the church are the means and pledges of salvation to the faithful." But let us read a little farther.

That the church is the body of that divine Lord who gave himself for

it, that as members of this body true believers are united in him its head, and thus partake of his fulness of mercy and grace, are truths of the divine word too frequently and too strongly set forth to be denied. p. 11.

What is this? "The church is the body of that divine Lord who gave himself for it." Very well. *The church* we admit—not the Episcopal denomination exclusively—is the body of Christ. "As members of this body, true believers are united in him its head, and thus partake of his fulness of mercy and grace." True believers are united to Christ by faith, by gratitude, by love, and in their common union with him they are united to each other; and as united in him they are members of his body; and thus, as united to him by faith—not as members of the church—they partake of his fulness of mercy and grace. The Bishop has indeed put together in this sentence several unquestionable Christian truths; but with his "*as*" and his "*thus*," he has placed them in relations to each other as monstrous as they are imaginary; and placed in such connections the truths themselves are distorted and, if we may use such a word, *unspiritualized*. But let us proceed. These truths our author says are "too strongly set forth to be denied."

But though not denied, how much are they neglected! How much decried, how odiously and contemptuously branded are all researches as to the mode by which, in this divine body of the Redeemer, power is to be derived to minister in its holy concerns, to dispense its ordinances! p. 11.

We believe that among evangelical Christians generally, disputations about the *mode* in which proper men may be constituted ministers of the gospel are indeed regarded rather as gendering strife than as ministering to godliness. And the fact that Dr. Hobart re-

gards these matters as being so momentous, seems to be altogether of a piece with the views which his language exhibits respecting spiritual renovation.

And yet, in this spiritual and divine society, no man can minister unless he be called of God by a commission visibly conferred for that purpose; and there can be no commission which is not derived from that Almighty Head of this mystical body, who only possesses all spiritual power, and who, vesting with his apostles the authority of conferring the right of ministering in holy things, pronounced the infallible promise, that this authority should be perpetuated "even to the end of the world." p. 11.

Here is the pith and point and conclusion of the whole argument;—the old story of the "uninterrupted succession," and the divinely commissioned priesthood, and the invalidity of all ministrations out of "the one Apostolic church." We are not going to controvert this argument. Our simple purpose is to give our readers a glimpse of the High-church opinions on this topic; and therefore without stopping to inquire of the Bishop on what text of Scripture he means to rest the assertion about "the infallible promise," we only ask our readers to observe what light these quotations throw upon the doctrine of the "moral means and external pledges" in the use of which the influences of the Divine Spirit are exclusively dispensed. But let us read on.

The Bishop of our church on these subjects may prudently and mildly enforce opinions which boast, in more modern times, of the support of some of the most distinguished names in learning and theology, and which, before papal corruption obscured and deformed them, ranked among their advocates the noble army of martyrs, and the goodly fellowship of apostles.—p. 11.

What the opinions are which are to be thus "prudently and mildly" enforced, may be guessed from what has gone before, and may be more distinctly ascertained by the following extract from a form of self-examination written by Bishop Hobart to be used by the devout Episcopalian when preparing for the celebration of the Lord's supper, or rather—in the Roman Catholic phraseology of the author—when preparing to receive the Holy Eucharist.

Am I a member of the Church of Christ, which he purchased with his blood, which he sanctifies with his Spirit, and which according to his sovereign pleasure, is made the channel of his *covenant* mercies to a fallen world?

Have I been admitted to the participation of the inestimable privileges of this Church; to a title to the forgiveness of sin, to the favour of God, to the aids of the Holy Spirit, to an inheritance in the kingdom of heaven; by that ordinance, which Jesus Christ, its divine head, instituted, the holy sacrament of Baptism?

Do I keep up my communion with this Church, by devout submission to the ministrations of its *priesthood* in the orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, deriving their authority by regular transmission from Jesus Christ, the Redeemer and Head of the Church, who has promised to be with the ministers of apostolic succession "always, even to the end of the world?"—*Companion for the Altar, 4th Edition, Revised and Corrected.* p. 35.

Such opinions as these must indeed be "prudently and mildly" enforced, if they are to be enforced at all. We live in an age and in a country in which if these opinions are successfully inculcated they must be inculcated only with great caution lest they startle the common sense of men, and be found on inspection to neutralize and entirely to annihilate the spirituality of the gospel. Men in this land and at this period of the world, will be likely to ask—when such sentiments are so distinctly set before

them as to rouse inquiry—how it comes to pass, if the value of Christianity as a way of salvation depends so much on forms and on succession and on a peculiar organization of its ministry,—how it comes to pass that while the New Testament is full of faith, and repentance, and obedience, and remission of sins through the blood of Christ, and sanctification by the Spirit of the Lord, it so neglects and throws into the back ground a whole class of subjects vitally important. And when men once begin to ask this question there is an end to the success of these opinions.

Is it not because these opinions can be enforced only "prudently and mildly," that the practice of High-churchmen so directly contradicts their theory? "None" says Dr. Hobart, "can possess authority to administer the sacraments but those who have received a commission from the *bishops* of the church." Wherever the gospel is promulgated the sacrament of *baptism* is the mode through which we must be admitted into covenant with God, and by which we must obtain a title to those blessings and privileges which Christ has purchased for his mystical body." "Considering the sacraments as *means* and *pledges* of divine grace and mercy, it must be evident that their efficacy depends not on any *inherent virtue*, but on the *power of God* which accompanies them. Hence results the important truth, that, in order to be effectual, to be acknowledged by God, and accompanied by his power, they must be administered by those who have received a commission for the purpose from him."* This is the theory. It makes baptism essential to communion with the church, and utterly denies the validity or value of any baptism which is not administered by the hands of an Episcopal clergyman. Now what would

*Companion for the Altar.

be the corresponding practice? What but to rebaptize every "dissenter" who "conforms" to the "one apostolic church?" And what is the actual practice of High-Churchmen in this particular? Do they not admit persons whose baptism they declare null and void, not only as occasional communicants, but as good and wholesome members of their church? Do they not ordain them deacons and priests, and commission them, unbaptized themselves, to baptize others? Do they not consecrate them bishops, and set them who have no valid title to those blessings and privileges which Christ has purchased for his mystical body, to rule that mystical body? Why are these things so? Is there any other reason for it but this,—that these opinions can be only "prudently and mildly" enforced? If there is we should be glad to know it.

Under the third division of the sermon, where the preacher speaks of "the authority of the Church," we find such sentiments as these.

Submission to the will of the church, legitimately expressed by its constituted authorities, not violating the plain prescriptions of the moral law, nor the positive determinations of the word of God, must know no limits. Resistance in such cases would substitute individual pleasure for public will, and would introduce disorder and misrule into that spiritual society, whose essential characteristics are subordination and unity; and, utterly incompatible with the humble and mild spirit of the Christian, must be most hateful in the sight of that divine Lord, whose prayer it was that his followers "might be one, always keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." Things indifferent, when thus enacted, and such are all things not plainly enjoined by reason, by conscience, or by the divine law, assume the awful force of the highest moral obligation. pp. 12, 13.

What language is this to be uttered in America. "Submission to the will of the Church," in "things indifferent" must know no limits!"

And who is to decide what are "things indifferent?" "Things indifferent," says our preacher, "are all things not plainly enjoined by reason, by conscience, or by the divine law." And who is to tell us what things are thus "not plainly enjoined?" Who but "the Church" speaking "by its constituted authorities?" For if any tribunal out of the Church is allowed to determine this question, then the whole theory of "authority" extending its full and unrestricted power, is nullified. Suppose the Church by its constituted authorities expresses its will that every minister shall wear one suit of drapery while reading the liturgy from the desk, and shall retire and change his raiment before he ascends the pulpit to preach;—who is to determine whether this is a thing indifferent or a thing inconsistent with the simplicity of Christian worship? The Church surely; for if every individual is to determine for himself whether the thing is proper or improper, the law is no more—the authority of the Church is simply the authority of advice and recommendation. So if the Church by its constituted authorities should enact that every minister must have his head shaved, who is to determine whether this is a thing indifferent? The Church has determined it already by that legislative act; and now every minister is bound to shave his head by "the awful force of the highest moral obligation." Suppose the Church enacts in due form to enlarge its hierarchy, to set up new orders of its ministers and rulers, to appoint archbishops and patriarchs, and a great bishop over all; who may say that this is not a thing indifferent, or shall dare to violate that "awful force" of "moral obligation" which is thus created? Suppose the Church should express its will that no layman shall read the scriptures unless they be bound in the same volume with the liturgy and some approved high Church commentary, who shall say that this de-

cretal does not "assume the awful force of the highest moral obligation." The truth is, there is no such thing as a divine power of legislation in the Church. Every ecclesiastical decree of whatever name—whether it be fulminated from the Vatican or backed by the anathemas of an ecumenical council—whether it be the edict of a bishop, or the enactment of a convention—whether it proceed from the conclave of a Methodist conference or from the sessions of a Presbyterian general assembly—whether it be the vote of a General Association or the simple recommendation of an occasional meeting—ought to be examined by every individual to whom it comes, and ought to be obeyed or rejected according as his conscientious judgment declares it to be right or wrong. To affirm the contrary is to open wide the door for all the worst abuses of the Papal tyranny. It was against these principles of Bishop Hobart, when they were "maintained" by the perjured James, and the misguided Charles, and the aspiring Laud, and when they were "enforced" by the terrors of the Star-chamber and the prison and the pillory—that our fathers revolted, choosing banishment and poverty, and a thousand dangers rather than submission.

Under the tenth and eleventh heads of the discourse, our author makes it the duty of a bishop to condemn prayer-meetings and to oppose revivals of religion. Respecting prayer-meetings he speaks thus.

He [the devout Christian] will not need the fictitious aids of those social meetings, which, well meant as they may sometimes be, and edifying as in some cases and to a certain extent they may for a time, prove, are generally, and from the constitution of human nature, almost necessarily, the theatres (in which spiritual pride, ambition and ostentation indulge their unhallowed aims, and excite those violent emotions of animal sensibility, which discourage instead

of inviting the presence of the meek, the mild, the humble graces of the Spirit. p. 23.

From such language as this it is refreshing to turn to what Mr. Millvaine says on the same subject.

He dares not discourage his people to "pray one with another." He feels bound to encourage a spirit of *social* as well as *private* prayer; of prayer "where two or three are met together" in the name of the Lord, as well as where but one soul desires "to obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need." He would not by any means censure such as should not think with him in this matter, nor would he think of establishing a participation in social prayer beyond the walls of the church, into a condition of Christian character, communion, fellowship, or love; but should any of his people find it edifying to spend an hour once a week at some unconsecrated place, in prayer and singing the praises of God, without using any pre-composed form, he would tremble at the thought of opposing them: nay, he would think it his duty to countenance them: he would ask their prayers for himself and his ministry; and should he, at any time, go in among them, though he would then think it right to take charge of the exercises, he would not scruple to pray in other language and with other arrangement than those in the liturgy.

Can it be possible that Christians should never pray together but in a church? or never, unless their exercises are conducted by a minister? or never, but in the words of a liturgy framed specially for the church? Is there any difference, in principle, between the meeting for prayer of ten people *composing a family*, and of ten connected by no tenderer tie than that of brethren in Christ? But the church has recognized the propriety of the former and of their praying *without a form*; for though she has provided a form of family prayer which *may* be used, she has not provided one which *must* be used; thus doing precisely what individuals of denominations, recognizing no form of public worship, have often done in composing manuals of family worship for the convenience of those who may not feel competent to conduct it without them.

Mr. M., in taking the ground above described, is consoled under whatever name may be given him, by the three following considerations:—

1st. The intrinsic reasonableness that Christians should be allowed to "pray one with another" in any convenient place, without being required to use a form of prayer composed for a kind of assemblage, and for circumstances exceedingly different from theirs.

2d. The fact that the church in prescribing nothing relative to any services but those of public worship, the administration of the sacrament, confirmation and ordination, has left her ministers and members, with regard to all other services, entirely at their discretion. For Mr. M. before he can think otherwise, must have something more conclusive than what is sometimes alleged, that because the church has appointed a liturgy for the *public* worship of her members on occasions of the regular morning and evening prayer, she has forbidden the use of anything but that liturgy, in *all circumstances* of social prayer in which her members can be engaged.

3d. The fact that so many ministers of the Episcopal Church, not only of those called *low churchmen*, but of others, are in the practice of what involves precisely the principles contended for, and that such a man and Christian and Episcopalian and prelate as *Bishop Griswold*, is the decided friend and defender of what he calls, in plain terms, "prayer meetings;" that in express defence of ground, precisely such as has just been taken in these pages, he has lately published a long communication in the *Episcopal Register*, the preliminary remarks of which conclude as follows: "We desire only that a few believers in Jesus Christ, and members of his 'Catholic and Apostolic Church,' sensible of their sins and of their many wants, may be permitted, without being judged or censured by their brethren, sometimes to spend an evening in praying for themselves and others, in reading God's word, and singing his praise, and speaking of his mercies."

We return to Bishop Hobart. Against revivals of religion, he breaks forth in a very tempest of excitement.

It is against these popular religious excitements, to which the term of "revivals of religion" is usually applied, that the Bishop of our church must, in duty to the highest interests of rational and fervent piety, bear his testimony—revivals "got up" by those popular arts that always excite the passions; and preserved and extended by a bold, and unlicensed, and constant employment of every mean by which animal sensibility may be roused, and the sympathies of our nature made to catch the false fires of enthusiasm. The Lord, indeed, rides in the whirlwind, and directs the storm, and in religion, as in nature, ultimately overrules them for good. But evils, sad evils are they; bearing devastation and desolation in their course—in the spiritual world, sweeping before them the courtesies of society, the affections of domestic life, the fair forms of rational and sober piety, and leaving, at last, the waste of disorder, misrule, and fanaticism, where the human passions riot, over which the friends of genuine religion mourn, and the scoffer raises the laugh of scorn. Surely, in firmly opposing these popular revivals of religion, the Bishop of our church will deserve the approbation of the wise and the good—certainly he will be approved by his God. p. 28.

It may be true that revivals of religion are some times *attempted* to be "got up," by "popular arts that excite the passions," and are attempted to be "preserved and extended by a bold, unlicensed, and constant employment of every mean by which animal sensibility may be roused, and the sympathies of our nature made to catch the false fires of enthusiasm." But Bishop Hobart *ought* to know that whatever extravagances may have taken place either of late or in times past, have been disowned and condemned by the friends of revivals no less decidedly than by himself. And he ought to know that the friends of revivals look on every such "art" as he has described with an eye as watchful as his own; and that they do so because they are well assured that such arts are certain to prevent a revival of

religion ; or, if a revival has already begun, are still more certain to bring it to a speedy termination. So far are the evils which he enumerates from being essential to "revivals," that the rumor of such evils having originated in connection with the late revivals within the geographical limits of our author's own diocese, has occasioned a controversy among some of the best and most widely respected ministers in our country—a controversy, over which thousands of fervent and humble Christians are praying with tears, and over which High-churchmen, and Unitarians, and Universalists, and the votaries of profaneness, are singing an unhal- lowed chorus of triumph. We are not going to express in this place any opinion on either side of that so much lamented controversy. But we may say here—what is directly connected with the matter before us—that so far as that debate has come before the public, the real question at issue is, how far min- isters at the west are chargeable with promoting or encouraging the excesses which rumor has ascribed to their agency. The question is ob- viously a question of fact—hardly at all a question of principle. That this is the nature of the question ap- pears not only from the published defences of the "western brethren" but even from the minutes of the New-Lebanon convention"—mis- quoted, garbled, misrepresented as they have been by Unitarians and High-churchmen. Why then this fanfaronade about revivals as "evils, sad evils," "sweeping before them the courtesies of society, the affec- tions of domestic life, the fair forms of sober and rational piety, and leav- ing at last the waste of disorder, mis- rule, and fanaticism." There is no language too strong to set forth the falsehood of this description.

We do not overlook the remarka- ble admission on this subject which our author makes in connection with the statement already quoted.

There may be times of more than ordinary attention in a congregation to spiritual objects. Some dispensation of Providence may arouse the thought- less and secure ; and the sinner, who has long resisted the monitions of con- science and the strivings of God's spi- rit, may at length yield ; and, awaken- ed and convicted, he may inquire, with deep earnestness and solicitude, con- cerning the things that belong to his eternal peace. By the influence of moral causes, as well as by the blessing of God's grace, the concern may ex- tend to others, and thus the number of those may be enlarged, who are prose- cuting, with a supreme devotedness, the infinitely momentous inquiry, what shall I do to be saved. p. 27.

"There may be times," then, "of more than ordinary attention" to re- ligious. And what is such a "time of more than ordinary attention" but a "revival," in the received significa- tion of the word ? High-church re- vivals, however, must begin with some "dispensation of Providence" to "arouse the thoughtless and se- cure." If this be indispensable to such a revival as Bishop Hobart will not condemn, then nearly all revi- vals from the beginning until now, stand condemned in the mass by this champion of "rational and sober piety." For it is a fact that the clear and earnest inculcation of religious truth, far more frequently than any dispensations of Providence, howev- er striking, is the means of rousing the attention of the thoughtless and secure. The God who spoke to his prophet at Horeb, not in the wind, nor in the earthquake, nor in the fire, but in the still small voice ; when he sees fit effectually to direct the attention of sinners to the things of their peace, speaks not in the dark and awful dispensations of his provi- dence, but "by the foolishness of preaching."

We will imagine a case which we should be very glad to believe has occurred in Bishop Hobart's con- gregation, and which we devoutly wish may occur there often for many

years to come. Suppose our author should preach on the text "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Suppose that preaching on this text, he should simply urge on his hearers with all the fervor of his ardent mind the great fact that all those who do not so repent as to become new creatures, will surely and utterly perish. Suppose that on the morrow, going about in his parish from family to family, he should find one and another, and another, impressed with the truth of that great fact, and desirous to flee from the wrath to come. Suppose that on the next Lord's day he should preach on this text, "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men," and should see in the thronged assembly many a tearful eye and many a countenance bearing the aspect of deep anxiety. What would he do in such a case? Would he say, Here has been no dispensation of Providence to arouse the thoughtless, and therefore these appearances of more than ordinary attention are delusive? Or would he thank God and take courage? And supposing him to be convinced that there was indeed more than ordinary attention in his congregation, would he deem it improper to invite those who felt a particular solicitude about the salvation of their souls to meet him at some convenient time in his study or his parlor? And suppose ten should come at once, or twenty, and he should converse with them individually, trying to ascertain the particular state and feelings of each mind, and urging each and all to receive Jesus Christ as their Redeemer and to lay hold on the hope set before them. And suppose that in consequence of this personal inquiry and advice some should actually find themselves trusting in God with a confidence and affection unknown before, and the others should find their solicitude becoming more intense and painful. And suppose that

when they came again, the number should be doubled. What would Dr. Hobart do in such a case? Would he recoil aghast at the results of his own preaching? Would he charge himself with a "bold and unlicensed" use of arts that "excite the passions?" Yet in stating this case, we have given the summary history of hundreds of "revivals."

The twelfth particular of a bishop's duty according to our author is, "In his endeavors for the general advancement of religion, he will use only the instrumentality of his own church." That is to say, He will not give his aid to circulate the Bible except in connection with the Liturgy; and he will keep at a distance from all institutions of Christian benevolence—Bible Societies, Tract Societies, Sunday School Unions, in which Christians of different denominations unite for the extension of the knowledge and honour of their common Saviour, in whom neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. On this topic we are happy to contrast the well-known opinions of our preacher with the sentiments of Mr. M'Ilvaine.

Again: Is it characteristic of a *low churchman* that he can unite and mingle with his brethren of other churches in the promotion of those schemes for the extension of the knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus," which involve no doctrine but what is common to all Christians? If so, then Mr. M. is very ready to own what he has always publicly manifested, that he is indeed a *low churchman*. He not only *can* mingle with his brethren of other denominations, on ground common to all, and independent of the peculiarities of any, in the promotion of such a cause (for example) as that of the circulation of the scriptures; but he *does* mingle with them, takes great pleasure, finds his heart cheered, his zeal animated, his faith strengthened, his love to God and man enlarged by such mingling. While he would not be considered as wishing to insinuate a solitary thought derogatory to the piety, zeal, conscientiousness of those among his brethren of the Episcopal Church, who, with regard to such things, or those before or here-

after to be mentioned, are diverse in their views, feelings, or practice from himself; while he can cordially allow to them the same freedom of opinion and action, that he thinks they should concede to him, and the large body of Episcopalians, who concur with him; he is free to avow the belief that, the better the true interests of the Episcopal Church are understood, the more her members will be found in the promotion of such schemes of usefulness as those under consideration; and that the further the gospel prevails, the more cordially, affectionately and universally will all that breathe the spirit and hold the grand essential doctrines of the cross of Christ, be seen breaking down "the middle wall of partition between them:" not forgetting or lightly esteeming their peculiarities, but consenting that they shall not prevent "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," and cordially associating on that broad and lovely territory of faith and holiness, the chief wealth and glory of all, in spreading far and wide "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus their Lord."

Is there any reason for Mr. M. or any who think with him, to be in the least apprehensive, not only of avowing a willingness to mingle with other denominations, but of exhibiting the practice of such mingling, when it is remembered that the venerable Bishop Hall could not only unite, in company with Bishop Davenant and Carlton, in all the business, worship and preaching at a Synod of Dort; but could say, in a sermon delivered before that Synod, "we are brethren, let us also be colleagues. What have we to do with the infamous titles of party name? We are Christians let us all be of the same mind. We are *one body*, let us also be unanimous." And again, in his *Irenicum*: "If a difference of opinion with regard to these points of external order must continue, why may we not be of one heart and of one mind? or why should this disagreement break the bonds of good brotherhood?"

Are any condemned upon such a charge as that under consideration, they will remember with satisfaction that the same good Bishop Hall is recorded to have said, when he took leave of the Synod of Dort, that "there was no place on earth so like heaven as the Synod of Dort (a synod of *non-episcopalians*) and where he should be more willing to dwell." They will also find consolation in taking refuge from the load of their condemnation under the safe patronage of the learned and eminently evangelical Usher, who could not only contrive the union of Episcopal and other churches without re-

quiring the re-ordination of those not episcopally ordained, but without that union, could heartily participate in the Lord's Supper at the hands of a non-episcopal ministry. They will very comfortably hide themselves under the broad lawn of the Archbishop of Canterbury; of the Archbishops of Cashel, of Tuam, of Dublin, and of *twenty-eight Bishops* of the churches of England and Ireland; who in being members and officers either of the *Naval and Military* or the *British and Foreign*, or the *Hibernian Bible Society*, in each of which, all denominations meet and act upon a perfect level, are just as obnoxious to Dr. Onderdonk's accusation, so far as acting with other denominations is concerned, as Mr. M. or any others who may be called *low churchmen*.

They will carefully recollect the participation which Bishops White, Kemp, Moore, and Chase, of their own land and church, have had in Bible Societies, in which the propriety of this mingling of denominations was fully recognized, because entirely practised upon. They will not forget how long and regularly the presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the United States, has acted as President of the Philadelphia Bible Society, in which so many distinctions of Christians are embraced; how honourably that venerable prelate has lately appeared at the head of the noble task of seeing that, before three years have expired, there shall not be a family in Pennsylvania destitute of a Bible; and lastly, how fully the House of Bishops, in their Pastoral Letter of 1814, recognized the principle and commended the doings of the British and Foreign Bible Society, when they said, "we avail ourselves of the opportunity of congratulating all the members of our church, in what we conceive to be eminently a cause of joy to the christian world in general, --- the wonderful efforts which have been made within these few years, being begun principally by members of the parent church, by a body known under the name of the *British and Foreign Bible Society*, to disperse the Bible, &c. We should conceive ourselves as wanting, on this occasion, to the high duties of our stations, were we to neglect to bear our testimony in favour of this energetic effort. &c.

It will be recollected by Dr. Onderdonk, that in a late conversation with a friend of Mr. M. in N. Y., after declaring that he gloried in his letter to Mr. Andrews, he expressed it as his opinion, that there were two great points which drew a plain and broad line of demarcation between the two parties in the church---meaning the *high and low churchmen*. One of these, (he said,) was the *union of Episcopalians with other denominations*, in the way above described. Of course, Mr. M. has reason to conclude, that one feature of his

low churchmanship in the eye of Dr. O. is his participation in such union. So that in this particular, the charge in question is entirely correct. But how comforting to be favoured with such companions in tribulation; how light the burden of condemnation when the shoulders of so many Bishops, Archbishops and Primates assist in its support! pp. 17—20.

Our limits will not permit us to add any thing to these statements; and indeed we should have little hope of moving Bishop Hobart, or those who are enlisted with him, by any argument which could be constructed on this subject. Their error on this point is not a superficial and solitary misapprehension; it lies deep, and is intimately connected with their first ideas of the Christian dispensation. Not till they shall rise to other and nobler conceptions respecting the relations of the Christian faith to the conversion of souls and the renovation of the world; not till they shall learn to believe more in the intrinsic efficacy of the simple truth of God and less in the value of forms, will they be able fully to understand the principles on which Christians differing about forms can unite for the diffusion of the word of life.

In concluding this article, already protracted beyond our original design, we cannot but call on Dr. Hobart to look about him and see with whom he and his party are joining themselves in the crusade which they proclaim, not only against the "doctrines of grace," but against Bible Societies, and prayer-meetings, and revivals of religion. Who are their friends and compeers in this warfare? Are they the majority of the humble, devout, fervent disciples of our Lord? In their opposition to the doctrines of grace, they do indeed find with them, in the letter of their belief more than in the spirit, one whole denomination of Christians, (the Wesleyan Methodist) distinguished for active and fervent piety. But when they take up arms against Bible Societies, and meetings for prayer and Christian conference,

and revivals of religion, who are their supporters? The Papist relaxes in their favor the frown of abhorrence with which he looks on all heretics, and smiles upon them as his allies. The Unitarian bids them all-hail. The Universalist wishes them success. The Deist offers them the grasp of fraternization. And as these various squadrons of the power of darkness under their several banners, come wheeling to the battle, this Protestant Christian Prelate joins them with his forces, and cheers them to the onset. We are not afraid for the result, for the Lord of Hosts is in the field, and he will pour defeat on all the opposers of his cause. We are not afraid; but we do grieve to see so considerable a portion of the Episcopal Church throwing themselves with all their resources into the ranks of the adversaries. And we would seriously and kindly call on Bishop Hobart to look about him and see with whom he is associated in this warfare. Is it with such spirits that he is willing to be numbered? No; we trust he is far from sympathizing in spirit with those on whose side he is found in act and effort. We trust that what he does in this way, is done ignorantly and not with the spirit of opposition to the truth. And we pray that as he pauses and looks around to see the position which he occupies, and the character of those with whom he has taken his stand, he may be induced to review the course which his mind has followed, and may be enabled to see the misconceptions and errors which have brought him into company so unseemly. He hopes to be associated hereafter with other spirits than these. He hopes to be found, in a better world than this, not only with those of his communion who join him in his virtual excommunication of all Christendom besides; but with the Owens, and Scotts, and Newtons, and Whitefields, who have looked out from within the pale of Episcopacy to acknowledge, and

kindly to greet as brethren and fellow-laborers, all who love our Lord Jesus Christ; and not with these only, but with thousands more who never owned allegiance to a prelate, who never received the ordinances through Episcopal ministrations, whose devotions find access to the throne of grace without being guided thither by the forms of any venerable liturgy, and who are now combining their energies (O that it were more and more with one heart and one spirit,) to subdue the kingdoms

of this world and make them the kingdom of our Lord. With them may he—and may we—be found at last, when the jarrings of controversy shall have ceased, and prejudices shall have vanished, and error shall be no more;—even with the multitude whom no man can number, who shall stand upon Mount Zion, in the sunlight of the throne, and whose voices shall be as the voice of many waters while they sing forever without one discordant note, the victories of the King of kings.

LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE.

THE SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS. A new periodical, bearing this title, and in respect to size, spirit, and general character, similar to the *Christian Spectator*, is about to be commenced in Boston.

Its design is,—as set forth in the Prospectus,—“to explain, defend, and promote that system of religion which was planted on this soil by the first settlers of New England; and to cherish all those great and beneficent institutions which they left as an invaluable legacy to their descendants. It will always be found on the side of free inquiry, enlarged views, unfettered discussion, frank and open measures, and genuine liberality. It will be decidedly opposed to that latitudinarianism in religion, which labours to destroy the distinction between the church and the world, and is fast approaching to infidelity. It looks confidently for patronage to those who receive the Word of God as the only authoritative arbiter of religious truth; who regard this Word, accompanied by the Holy Spirit, as able to make men wise unto salvation; and who have no confidence in systems, which in effect discard the Sacred Volume, and rely principally upon the discoveries of human reason.”

The patrons of the new work have apprised the public that “it is commenced after the most full and fraternal conference with the Conductors of the

Christian Spectator, and has their best wishes for its success.” Instead of regarding it as an interference with the latter work, the Conductors have cheerfully acquiesced in its establishment; they regard it as in some sense a branch of their own publication,—issuing from a different point for the accomplishment of special purposes, but co-operating with them in harmonious views and efforts for the promotion of the Redeemer's kingdom.

While we may now leave, in a good degree, to the sister publication those subjects of controversy which it more especially contemplates, we are at liberty to turn ourselves to other subjects of wide and general interest to the community; and pursuing these in a tone of free and elevated inquiry, and in the spirit of Christian faithfulness as well as of Christian liberality, we shall constantly keep in view the high aim of the *Christian Spectator*,—striving to make it the instrument, however humble, of advancing the great cause to which it has been consecrated.

NEW PERIODICALS. Among the new periodicals commenced the present year we notice the following:

The *Repository and Christian Review*—to be published quarterly, by

Lincoln & Edmands, Boston, in numbers of 80 pages, at two dollars a year. The Editors are the Rev. Professors Chase and Ripley, of the Baptist Seminary at Newton.

The *Magazine of the German Reformed Church*, 32 pages monthly, at \$1.50 in advance. To be edited at the Seminary at Gettysburgh, under the management and supervision of the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the German Reformed Church.

The *Evangelical Museum*, conducted by Colin M'Iver, V. D. M. Fayetteville, N. C.—A monthly of 48 pages—\$3 in advance. This work is to consist chiefly, and for the present entirely, of selections from the best periodicals, American and foreign. The first number is judiciously compiled.

The *Virginia and North Carolina Presbyterian Preacher*, to contain Sermons from Clergymen of those States. Edited by Colin M'Iver, V. D. M.

The *Western Preacher*, to contain Sermons from Ministers of the Western District of New York. Under the direction of Beriah B. Hotchkiss, of Leroy.

The *Home Missionary, and American Pastor's Journal*. The Committee of the American Home Missionary Society have determined to establish a Magazine with this title. "The increasing demand for Home Missionary Intelligence, and the present magnitude and importance of the Home Missionary cause," the Managers state, "require the publication of a periodical work in aid of its interests." The *American Pastor's Journal*, lately projected by the Rev. Austin Dickinson, is to be incorporated, as far as practicable, with the work, the proprietor having relinquished it for that purpose.

Kenrick's Exposition of the Historical Writings of the New Testament is about to be published in Boston, with reflections subjoined to each section, and a Chronological Table of the Histories of the Evangelists, and Chronology of the Acts of the Apostles. It will form three vols. 8vo., and be furnished to subscribers at \$5.

Vol. II—No. 3.

A Series of Sermons on the thirty-third chapter of Deuteronomy is about to be published by the Rev. Mr. Parkinson, of the First Baptist Church in New-York.

The Rev. Dr. Green of Philadelphia, is about to prepare a Biographical account of the late Rev. Joseph Eastburn.

Gibbs' Hebrew Lexicon.—It will be gratifying to the public as it has been to ourselves to learn that this valuable work has been republished in London. The periodicals of that country speak highly of the improvements which Professor Gibbs has made on the original work; and acknowledge the indebtedness of the theological and biblical world for his labors.

The Memoirs of Mrs. Huntington, by the Rev. Mr. Wisner, have also been republished in that country, with a commendatory notice by the Rev. Dr. Gordon, of Edinburgh.

Joshua H. Hayward, M.D., of Boston, has been appointed Professor of Anatomy and Surgery, in the University of Vermont, at Burlington.

The Legislature of Alabama have passed a bill selecting Tuscaloosa as the site for a University.

Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, the celebrated German Theologian, died lately at Gottingen, aged seventy-five, having been a Professor thirty-nine years.

A Professor of the Shanskrit language has been endowed at Oxford University, by the late Colonel Boden; "being of opinion" says the testator, "that a more general and critical knowledge of that language will be a means of enabling my countrymen to proceed in the conversion of the natives of India to the Christian religion, by disseminating a knowledge of the sacred Scriptures amongst them more effectually than all other means whatever." The amount of the legacy is computed at between 20 and 30,000*l*.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

RELIGIOUS.

Review of a Sermon, entitled "The Christian Bishop approving himself unto God: in reference to the present state of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States." Preached by Bishop Hobart, at the Consecration of Henry U. Onderdonk, D.D. Assistant Bishop of Pennsylvania. By William Wisner, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Ithaca, N. Y. 8vo. pp. 32. Ithaca: 1828.

A Sermon, preached at Woodstock, Vt. Nov. 28, 1827, at the Ordination of the Rev. John Richards, as Pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in that place. By Bennet Tyler, D.D., President of Dartmouth College. 8vo. pp. 17. Woodstock: 1827.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Letter from a Gentleman in Boston to a Unitarian Clergyman in that city. Second edition. pp. 20, 12mo. Boston.

An Address on Female Education, delivered Nov. 21, 1827, at the opening of the Edifice erected for the accommodation of the Hartford Female Seminary.

By T. H. Gallaudet, Principal of the American Asylum for the education of the Deaf and Dumb. Published at the request of the Trustees. Hartford.

A Statement of what has been recently done to supply the destitute in the State of New Jersey, with the Sacred Scriptures. Published at the request of the Executive Committee of the New Jersey Bible Society. 8vo. pp. 38. 1827.

Scripture Natural History of Birds, Insects, &c.; with Reflections designed for the young. By Henry Athland. 2 vols. Hartford: D. F. Robinson & Co.

Reply and Review of "a Letter of a Gentleman in Boston to a Unitarian Clergyman of that city."

First Annual Report of the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance. 8vo. pp. 67. Andover: 1826.

Fine Arts: A Reply to Article, No. LVIII, in the North American Review, entitled Academies of Arts, &c. By Samuel F. B. Morse, President of the National Academy of Design. 8vo. pp. 15. New-York: G. & C. Carvill. 1828.

Corra; or the Genius of America. 18mo. pp. 260. Philadelphia: E. Little. 1828.

The Humors of Eutopia: a Tale of Colonial Times. By an Utopian. 2 vols. 12mo. Philadelphia: 1828.

MONTHLY RECORD.

RELIGIOUS.

The last Missionary Herald contains a Retrospective View of what has been done in the great work of evangelizing the world. The article is longer than we can well afford room for in our Record, but on perusing it for the purpose of selecting, we find but little that we are willing to omit. It is valuable particularly as it gives in one view the present state of benevolent operations; and it will serve as a reference with which to compare these operations in their future progress.

The fires of Christianity, which have been kindled by missionaries in various parts of INDIA, have been seen, the past year, to flame in many places, with increasing lustre. From Culna,—a po-

pulous city, a day's journey northward of Calcutta, and in the midst of a populous country where a thousand children have been taught in Christian schools,—we have heard of a written petition from the principal inhabitants for a Christian missionary to reside among them. Ten miles farther north is the town of *Burdwan*, where the Church Missionary Society has established a seminary for native boys, around which, in contiguous villages, are fifteen mission-schools, containing eleven hundred youths. We have heard, that a village in this vicinity has also requested Christian instruction. At *Dinagore*, *Monghyr*, and *Benares*—the last of these the ancient seat of brahminical learning, and the "holy city" of their religion, and all of them in the interior of India,—we have seen animating evidence of a progressive Christian indu-

ence: and we have learned that the late bishop Heber, in a single tour through the upper provinces, had personal intercourse with more than two hundred native converts, the result of missionary exertion, and yet saw less than half of such as are connected with only the episcopal missions in those provinces.

Travelling south from Calcutta, we pass through a village, a few miles distant from that city, of which interesting accounts were received a year ago. These have been confirmed the past year. It is now rendered certain, that the inhabitants of *Rammakalchoke* have destroyed the image of their idol god, demolished his temple, and of the materials of that temple erected a substantial Christian church.—Proceeding down the eastern side of peninsular India, we enter the country where the apostolic Swartz labored fifty years as a missionary. Here, under his ministrations, more than 6,000 natives were induced to forsake idolatry; and the past year we have seen it stated in the correspondence of bishop Heber, who visited *Tanjore*, and is an unexceptionable witness, that this number has since been increased, and that the brahmins find difficulty in procuring votaries enough to speed the ponderous wheels of their idolatrous cars through the deep lanes of that fertile country.

Advancing still farther south, a more interesting scene opens. What we heard and stated a year ago, has since been amply illustrated and confirmed. More than one thousand families, in the district of southern India, called *Palamcottah*, have lately renounced idolatry, and assemble, every Sabbath day, in more than a hundred villages, to learn the way of salvation through the Gospel. At one village, the missionary was conducted to a former temple of idolatry converted into a Christian sanctuary, and saw the idol of stone, which several generations had worshipped, lying outside, rejected, despised, and to be no more revered. Nor was this by any means a solitary instance. Numerous idols had been destroyed, and several idol temples either demolished, or consecrated to the worship of the true God. And this was in *INDIA*, where some affirm that missions have failed!

After remarking that a fatal blow has probably been given, the past year, to the horrid practice of burning widows on the funeral piles of their husbands, we cross the straits of *Manaar*, to the island of *CEYLON*.

On this island, containing a million and a half of souls, about thirty missionaries are employed, and so great an impression is making on idolatry, by their joint labors, that, as the Methodist missionaries believe, the time cannot be remote when the entire population shall be rescued from the superstitions of Buddhism, and its dark and polluting system of demon worship.

We next direct our attention far to the north, to a line of *GERMAN COLONIES* skirting the northern shores of the Black Sea and the northern frontier of Turkey, even to the borders of Persia. These colonies have been brought out to our view the past year. They have been planted during the last twenty-five years, and have carried with them the seeds of Christianity. We have heard, that a missionary society in Germany has sent evangelical ministers among them, to fan the flames of piety, and prepare a Christian influence to be exerted on the neighboring millions of Russia, and Persia, and Turkey.

Turning our eyes now to that interesting region, which was anciently the dwelling place of the church of God, what do we behold? The inhabitants of *Mount Lebanon*—comparatively a hardy, courageous, and intelligent people—become so sensitive to the approach of truth, that the missionaries at *Beyroot* are obliged to restrain themselves from travelling, lest the country be thrown into uproar—as *Ephesus* was, by the apostle Paul; and yet, in their houses, they find full occupation in conversing with such, as brave the terrors of spiritual excommunication to call upon them. We almost tremble to hear again from that land, lest some of the messengers of our churches may have fallen beneath the scimitar of the Turk, or the dagger of the vengeful papist of the mountain.

We have heard, also, that *GREECE*, through the merciful providence of the Lord of armies, is virtually free, and we shall watch with solicitude, during the present year, to see if the gifted minds of her population can be rendered accessible to the influence of the

Gospel. The same great event, which broke the chains of Greece, shook, also, the power of the Moslem in Europe; and we shall probably know this year, whether the baleful flood, which has so long spread desolation over the fairest portion of Asia, is to be speedily rolled back, and lay open the *Seven Churches* to the reanimating influence of the Sun of Righteousness.

And now, leaving Asia and Europe, let us look for a moment to AFRICA, and observe the indications of favor to that abused continent.

In the north-eastern part of it, and south of Egypt, lies ABYSSINIA, where the Gospel was planted by missionaries from Egypt, before the age of Mahommed. God, in his providence, preserved this people from the conquering sword of that impostor. During twelve centuries, though scarcely known to the rest of the Christian world, they have preserved a nominal Christianity, and have received their patriarchs from the Coptic, or ancient Christian church of Egypt. But lately, on account of the intemperance and other vices of their patriarch, he was expelled from the country, the alliance of forty generations with the Coptic church was broken off, and a messenger was sent to Egypt to request a spiritual head from the Armenians. Saying nothing of this movement in Abyssinia in favour of sound morals, behold the good providence of God in regard to their messenger. He comes to Egypt just as missionaries had arrived there from England, destined for Abyssinia—meets with them—forms an acquaintance with them over the New-Testament—becomes attached to them—accompanies them and one of our missionaries to Syria—resides in the mission families at Beyroot, and observes their manner of life, faith, long-suffering, charity—becomes acquainted with pious Armenians in those families—gives evidence himself of possessing humble, devoted piety—invites the missionaries, destined for his country, to accompany him on his return—and offers them all the protection he can give them by the way, and an introduction to his countrymen. Now behold the favor of God towards Africa: *first*, in preserving even a nominal Christian church in such a central position as Abyssinia; and *secondly*, in

sending such a man into Egypt, and on such a message, and at such a time; and in sending missionaries to meet him, though they knew it not; and in leading him to such a full acquaintance with the nature, design, purity, and excellence of protestant missions.

Let us turn our eyes to the other side of Africa,—to its WESTERN SHORES. The intelligence of the last year seems to place beyond reasonable controversy the practicability and usefulness of colonising western Africa with a Christian population of free colored people. This is not all. The researches of the colony in Liberia have made us acquainted with a most interesting field of missionary labor in that country, and a society in Germany, and three societies in the United States have already resolved to take possession of it.—And how blessed will be the day, when missionaries from Liberia, and missionaries from Abyssinia, shall meet each other, for the first time, on the healthful table-lands of Central Africa!

FROM SOUTHERN AFRICA, we have heard, the past year, that about thirty missionary stations are there occupied; and if they flourish the present year as they have hitherto, some thousands of Hottentots and Caffres, who have been raised from the lowest depth of degradation, and collected into orderly and respectable villages, will, under the fostering influence of schools and a Christian ministry, make further advances in the career of civilization and social enjoyment.

We now take our departure from the eastern continents, and direct our attention, for a moment, to the ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC, on the other side of the globe.

And *first* to the ISLANDS IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC.—The intelligence of the past year enables us to say, definitively and positively, that the influence of Christian missions has driven idolatry entirely from *twenty-one* islands. Their inhabitants are no more alarmed by the noise of war, nor by the shriek of victims immolated on the altars of demons: and they have been taught to read, and write, and to make provision for the necessities, the decencies, and the comforts of life. Some thousands have been introduced into the Christian church upon a credible profession of piety.

When one island had received the gospel, its inhabitants had exerted themselves to send it to another. The intelligence of the past year states, that a missionary society of one group, and that not the largest, contributed in a single year, of the productions of the country, to the value of more than a thousand dollars; that thirty pious natives had gone as missionary teachers to islands and a people, which to them were strange and foreign; and that thirteen missionary stations are occupied by native missionaries alone.

From our own mission at the SANDWICH ISLANDS, we have heard of animating success among the natives, and of bitter opposition from foreign residents and visitants;—which opposition, however, has been the means of making the existence and prosperity of the mission known to thousands in this country and in England, who otherwise might have remained in ignorance respecting it; and so the wrath of man has been overruled for good.

We are now about to end our long, but delightful pilgrimage through the world, in survey of the divine goodness and of the progress of the reign of righteousness.

It is but a little distance from the Sandwich Islands to the WESTERN SHORES OF THE AMERICAN CONTINENT, on which we hope to see a missionary station within two years. From thence crossing the Rocky Mountains, and coming four hundred miles this side—but at a distance from us of more than half the space to the Pacific ocean—we may be surprised at hearing the songs of Zion, where, perhaps, we were trembling lest we should hear the wailing of the savage of the wilderness. At that remote distance,* the American Board of Missions has missionary stations. After we had travelled still farther towards the abode of civilized life, we should find other missionaries,† and might cheer our minds by intercourse with pious natives of the forest. There we should hear, if we had not heard before, that the venerable Indian, the father of Catherine Brown, and of four or five others who are believed to be members of the household of faith, died in peace, the past year, rejoicing in hope of the glory of God.

* Among the Osages. † At Dwight.

In our progress eastward, we should cross the Mississippi, and then should find the benevolent missionaries, with their schools and preaching houses, occupying numerous spots in the wide forest. In less than a month, we might visit, perhaps, twenty of these interesting stations.

Among the CHOCTAWS we should find, in many of their families, books in their own language. And if we inquired *how* and *when* they were obtained, and *who gave their language a written form?* we should be informed, that these books were prepared by missionaries, that their language was reduced to writing by missionaries, that the books were printed for them by a missionary society, and that most of them were prepared during the past year.

Among the CHEROKEES, if we arrived early in the present year, we might find a printing press erecting in the midst of the wilderness, but at the seat of their now regularly organized government—a printing press, purchased by the Cherokees themselves, and to be conducted by one of their own people;—who had been, however, taught by the missionaries, and became hopefully a child of God in consequence of their labors.

We have now returned from our wide survey into the bosom of our own country.—In respect to that, the past year has been more remarkable, than any one that has preceded. Never a year commenced with so many revivals of religion. They were not confined to one district, or State, but were in almost all the States and districts of the land. How many were added to the churches of our Lord Jesus Christ in consequence of them, we have not the means of knowing;—probably more than 50,000—perhaps 100,000.

The year has also been remarkable for great designs in Christian benevolence; and as remarkable for their prompt and rapid execution. The standard of devotedness, of self-denial, of Christian activity, has risen greatly. Many men have subscribed a thousand dollars a year, who before were content with subscribing an hundred. The Bible cause has received a mighty impulse. It has already been resolved in six States, that those States shall shortly be supplied with the Bible, and the example is exerting a strong influence.

It has been resolved in one State, to raise forty thousand dollars, in two years, to furnish schools, teachers, and missionaries for its destitute places; and this example will doubtless be followed.—What are to be the events of the coming year, we know not; but our expectations are raised. The demand upon our prayers, our liberality, and our exertions, will doubtless be great; and so, also, will be the reward.

Missions of the American Board.—

The following summary of the operations of this Society, as given in the Herald for January, presents us with forty-one stations, occupied either in countries where the Gospel has not before been proclaimed, or where it had been obscured and perverted by the corruptions of declining ages. At these stations, laborers are employed in the numbers and proportions stated in the following table.

Ministers of the Gospel, (in the survey called <i>Missionaries</i> ,)	41
Physicians, (besides one who is also a clergyman,)	4
Teachers,	27
Printers,	3
Farmers,	17
Mechanics,	6
Females, married and unmarried,	102
Whole number,	200

Several of the clergymen acquired, before leaving this country, a considerable knowledge of the medical and surgical arts. One, who is enumerated among the physicians, is also a licensed preacher, and all are employed more or less in the business of instruction. A few of the *teachers* have received license to preach the Gospel.

The number of pupils in the schools connected with the stations, is not less than 30,000; and about 500 native teachers are employed in them. Not far from 300 persons have been received into the mission churches.

The missionaries will employ the press, during the present year, for the dissemination of knowledge in nine languages;—the Mahratta, Tamul, Italian, Greek, Armenian, Arabic, Hawaiian, Choctaw, and Cherokee. The Hawaiian and Choctaw languages they were the first to reduce to writing; and the same is true of the Cherokee, so far as the English alphabet is used:

the *syllabic* alphabet was the invention of a Cherokee. Presses are owned and employed by the missions at Bombay, in Ceylon, in Western Asia, and at the Sandwich Islands. The printing for the Choctaws has been executed in Ohio. Among the Cherokees, the printing for the mission will be performed at a press belonging to the Cherokee government.

We have not the means of exactly estimating the amount of printing in the several missions. The following table may be regarded as exhibiting a near approximation to accuracy.

At Bombay, in the *Mahratta* language, previous to 1827; general size, 8vo, average number of pages in a copy, 47;—

	No. of copies.
For the mission,	181,210
For others,	25,500
	206,710

At Malta, previous to 1826;—In *Modern Greek*; 12mo and 18mo; average number of pages 36; for the mission,

60,200

For London Missionary Society; average number of pages 254,

2,000

In *Italian*; average number of pages 29;

27,000

12mo and 18mo,

450

In *Græco-Turkish*,

39,650

At the Sandwich Islands, in *Hawaiian*, previous to 1827; average number of pages 18;

130,000

Whole number of copies, 426,360

The New Testament in Mahratta, printed in different portions, is included in the above estimate. The printing in the Choctaw language consists chiefly of elementary school books, scripture extracts, and religious biography: the number of copies not reported. The printing in Cherokee will commence soon after the erection of the native press in the Cherokee country, which will be early in the present year.

American Jews Society.—The Board of Directors of this Society have purchased a farm of 500 acres, in the town of New-Paltz, on the margin of the

Hudson, directly opposite Hyde Park, at a cost of \$6500. A committee has been appointed to procure a suitable person to superintend the farm; and also to supply it with stock, and in all respects fit it for the reception of Jewish converts.

Christian Liberty.—We are happy in witnessing that the flame of Christian benevolence which broke out with so much splendor at the late memorable meeting of the American Board, has been visible since in other parts of our country. A meeting on the subject of Foreign Missions was recently held at Charleston, at which the Rev. Messrs. King and Kirk, agents of the American Board, were present. Among other subscriptions, were three of \$1000 a year for five years, by members of the Third Presbyterian Church.

Popery at the Sandwich Islands.—Several Roman Catholic Missionaries, Mechanics, &c. have recently arrived at these Islands, with a view of settlement. The friends of religion will regard the event with deep solicitude.

POLITICAL.

Constantinople.—The Ambassadors of the Allied Powers having ultimately failed of inducing the Porte to accept of their intervention in respect to the affairs of Greece, have departed from Constantinople. Active preparations were making for war by the Porte: but it was supposed, notwithstanding, that the Porte had no intention of coming to such an issue. No violent proceedings have followed the battle of Navarin.

Russia and Persia.—A late victory over the Persians by the Russians has resulted in a treaty of peace on the following conditions: That the Russians are to retain in full territorial possession all the country to the north of the Araxas, and a small portion of that lying to the southward; that all the expenses of the war are to be paid by the Persians; and that the Russians are to hold certain fortresses and additional territory as guarantee for the fulfilment of this part of the treaty.

Arabia.—The Wahabites, taking advantage of the absence of the Pacha

of Egypt with his principal forces, have again appeared in rebellion, and attacked the Mahometan holy city, and put to the sword 4000 of its inhabitants.

Java.—An armistice has been concluded between the Dutch authorities and the natives. This measure, it is hoped, will result in the restoration of peace.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Greeks.—The intelligence which is brought us by the late arrival of our countryman, Dr. Howe, is such as to strengthen our expectations concerning this oppressed nation. The battle of Navarin has entirely changed their prospects. Instead of retreating to the islands, and there making their last stand for Grecian independence, they now confidently hope to be able to rescue the Morea as well as the islands from their oppressors. "If left," says Dr. H. "to continue the struggle single-handed with Turkey, she will probably come off conqueror: her fleet will be able to resist the enemy's, and if supplies are cut off from Egypt only three months, Ibrahim Pasha must quit the Morea, or starve; and in six, every fortress in it must fall into the hands of the Greeks."

Greece still needs assistance, and must continue to need it till peace gives her an opportunity to cultivate the soil; and it is the object of Dr. H. to this country to solicit our aid, particularly in the establishment of hospitals for the sick and destitute. Our citizens, like those in many other parts of our country, are now making commendable exertions for their relief.

The Hon. De Witt Clinton, Governor of the State of New-York, deceased very suddenly on the 11th of February. The deep-felt emotions which that event has produced throughout the community, particularly in the State over which he presided, show the high estimation in which he was held; and he has left behind him the monuments of his useful life, which will render him memorable among future generations.

Major-General Jacob Brown, Commander-in-Chief of the Army of the United States, and the firm and devoted friend of his country, expired at his residence in Washington on the 24th

of February.—He was one of the oldest and warmest friends and admirers of Gov. Clinton; whom he is thus speedily called to meet in another world.

Lotteries.—A memorial on the subject of Lotteries has been presented to the Legislature of Pennsylvania, signed by the Mayor and other highly respectable gentlemen of Philadelphia. As a system of revenue, the memorialists show that a more absurd and extravagant mode of raising money could not well be devised. They take for example the Union Canal Lottery, and show that while only \$18,530 are derived for the use of the State, \$41,870 go to the brokers and managers.

The cost of collecting this tax, therefore, amounts to upwards of two hundred and twenty-five per cent. more than the sum realized for the object, for which the lottery is granted. And what renders this extravagant levy more lamentably disastrous is, that the money is principally abstracted from the hard earnings of those classes who are pressed by their wants and necessities on the one hand, and on the other, are deluded by the golden

promises incessantly reiterated, enforced, and thrust before them, by designing and interested lottery brokers.

And such is the infatuation of the people, that these lotteries are produced and succeed each other with ruinous rapidity, at the rate generally of one per month; which, if this be taken as an average, will make the enormous annual tax of \$724,800, obtained almost exclusively from the uninformed, and labouring class of the community. No data have been obtained to ascertain the fact, but it is supposed, that the amount of foreign lottery tickets, sold in this state, is not less than that of our own lotteries, and if this supposition be well founded, the aggregate tax paid annually for the support of lotteries, by the inhabitants of this commonwealth, is \$1,419,600.

But the pecuniary loss to the people, great as it is, is not to be placed in comparison with the injury which has been done to their morals. It is believed, that many cases of total loss of character, gross licentiousness, poverty, ruin, and even suicide, might be traced to gambling and lotteries.

ORDINATIONS AND INSTALLATIONS.

Dec. 2.—Rev. ISAAC S. DEMUND, over the Reformed Dutch church at Walpack, N. J. Sermon by Rev. C. C. Elting.

Jan. 16.—Rev. Mr. HUBBARD, as Pastor of the Congregational church in Monson, Me.

Jan. 21.—Rev. EDWIN HOLMES was installed as Pastor of the Reformed Dutch church of Linthgow, town of Livingston, N. Y. Sermon by Rev. G. W. Bethune of Rhinebeck.

Jan. 24.—Rev. JOSIAH S. HAWES, over the Congregational church at Great Falls, Somerworth, N. H. Ser-

mon by Rev. Mr. Greenleaf of Wells, Me.

Jan. 24.—Rev. JERVIS B. BUXTON, to the holy order of Deacons, in Elizabeth city, N. C., by Bishop Ravenscroft.

Jan. 31.—Rev. BENSON C. BALDWIN over the church at Norwich Falls. Sermon by Rev. John Nelson.

Jan. —.—Rev. NATHAN STERN, to the holy order of Deacons, at Worthington, Ohio, by Bishop Chase.

—.—Rev. SAMUEL A. BUMSTEAD, at Boston as an Evangelist.

IN consequence of the unexpected length to which we have suffered ourselves to be carried in our review of Bishop Hobart, we are obliged to omit one or two smaller reviews, as well as some other matters.